This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

E. DORSCH, M. D.
Monroe, Mich.

THE DORSCH LIBRARY.

The prfvate Library of Edward Dorsch, M. D., of Monroe, Michigan, presented to the University of Michigan by his widow, May, 1888, in accordance with a wish expressed by him.

[illegible]

AC
8
.K35
cop.2

36697

ESSAYS

ETHNOLOGICAL

AND

LINGUISTIC

BY THE LATE

JAMES KENNEDY Esq., LL.B.

FORMERLY HER BRITANNIC MAJESTY'S JUDGE AT THE HAVANA.

EDITED BY

C. M. KENNEDY, B.A.

EDWARD DORSCH.

WILLIAMS & NORGATE

14 HENRIETTA STREET, COVENT GARDEN, LONDON;

AND

20 SOUTH FREDERICK STREET, EDINBURGH.

1861.

PRINTED BY B. G. TEUBNER, LEIPZIG.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

page

Introduction 1

I. On the Ancient Languages of France and Spain. Read before the Philological Society June 22. 1855. 1

II. On the Ethnology and Civilization of the Ancient Britons. Read before the Ethnological Society July 8. 1857. 26

III. Suggestions respecting the Nationality and Language of the Ancient Etruscans. Read before the Ethnological Society December 9. 1857. 54

IV. Ethnological Notices of the Philippine Islands and Observations respecting the Malays. Read before the Ethnological Society June 6. 1855. 68

V. On the Probable Origin of the American Indians with particular reference to that of the Caribs. Read before the Ethnological Society March 15. 1854. 87

VI. Supplementary Notices of the American Indians especially the Mayas, the Caribs, the Arrawaks and the Mosquitos. Read before the Ethnological Society May 14. 1856. 124

VII. Hints on the Formation of a New English Dictionary. Read before the Philological Society May 20. 1858. 153

VIII. Question of the Supposed lost Tribes of Israel, with Appendices on the six days of the Creation, and on the chronology of the World. Read before the British association at Liverpool September. 26. 1854. 164

Note I. Respecting the Basques 214

Note. II. Respecting traces of Phœnician Civilization to be found in Central America 216

PREFACE.

The following Papers, most of which were read before the Ethnological Society, were intended to form an introductory volume to two larger works, the one on the origin and character of the Basque language and people, the other relative to the knowledge of America possessed by the Ancients. With the exception of the Essays on the ancient languages of France and Spain, on the lost Tribes of Israel, and the first notice respecting the American Indians, which have already been published, these Papers were not prepared by the author for publication, and this circumstance will explain the repetitions which will occasionally be met with. They have been printed from the original M. S. without alteration, as I considered it more advisable to do so than to make any verbal changes in the text. A further paper would have been written respecting the progress of the Celts through Europe, in which their passage westward was intended to be traced from the names of localities in which the word "gal" in its varying forms occurs, and from the remains of Celtic customs and usages still to be found in Eastern and Central Europe, as well as from linguistic affinities. No Notes however came into my possession from which an abstract could be given of this intended Essay, or of the work on the Basques. I have given a short sketch of what I believe my father intended to have written about America, but as the few pages which he has left con-

tained only a general introduction, recapitulating what has been already stated in some of the Papers in this volume on the subject of ancient civilization and its origin, and the early chronology of the world, I was unable to make much use of them; nor are they in their present state of sufficient value to be given as a fragment. In writing this sketch I made use of some references and notes which I found, but I must take the whole responsibility of the statements and arguments contained in it.

There were two points which my father intended to put forward, but which I have been unable to bring to any satisfactory issue, and I will therefore simply state them; they were 1st, That Tyrhena was formed from Tyre in the same way that Carthagena was formed from Carthage, and showed that there was a Tyrian as well as a Lydian settlement in Etruria; other evidence was to have been brought to bear on this theory. And 2nd, That an affinity can be traced between the former inhabitants of Central America, and the Phœnicians, from the name of the most powerful tribe of the former, the Itzas. The Hebrew names of Sidon and Tyre are Tzidon and Tzor and in the names of other places in Palestine the same combination of Tz occurs. This must almost necessarily have had an initial vowel; arguments would have been employed to show that this was in all probability an I, and names of places on the Mediterranean would have been quoted in support of this view. In Yucatan the most influential tribe was the Itza, and the names of the more important towns were formed with compounds of that word thus Chichen-Itza, Itzamal or Uxmal, Itzal or Sisal &c.; and this circumstance would have been adduced as an additional mark by which to trace the establishments of the Phœnicians beyond the limits of their own country.

With regard to the Essays contained in this Volume, the only point in the Paper on the Ancient Languages of France and Spain which calls for particular attention as being

opposed to generally received opinions is the theory that the Aquitani and the Iberi were the same people, and are now represented by the Gael.

Dr. Vaughan in his "Revolution of English History" expresses views similar to those maintained in the Essay on the civilization of the ancient Britons. He denies that the custom of painting the body is necessarily a proof of barbarism. He asserts that the existence of war chariots shows that there must have been good smiths, carpenters and wheelwrights; while the harness required for the horses, and the personal ornaments worn by the people in general, evince the constant exercise of trades incompatible with barbarism. Cæsar describes the buildings in Britain as similar to those of Gaul, and Gaul we know contained cities of considerable strength and beauty: this was a subject in regard to which Cæsar could have been under no misapprehension, though he might easily have been misinformed with respect to details of domestic customs: and in describing the effect of the Roman and Saxon conquests, Dr. Vaughan considers that the language of the Britons has had much more influence on the English language than is generally supposed. This circumstance is pointed out at length with numerous instances in support of it, in the late Mr. Garnett's Essay on the Languages and Dialects of the British Islands included in the collection of his Essays which forms one of the volumes of this series.

With regard to the question of the nationality of the Etruscans, it would seem to me that the safest, as well as the most philosophical course to pursue, is to consider the evidence afforded by the ancient remains to be found in Etruria, and in Lydia and the adjoining regions. The conclusions, which persons who are qualified to form opinions on the subject deduce from an examination of these antiquities appear to me to be more entitled to our attention than mere abstract reasonings or theories. Sir Charles Fellowes speak-

ing of the remains at Myra (Lycia) says that the custom of colouring the bas-reliefs and the mode of doing it, as well as the similarity of the action of the figures, removed one of the few doubts he still entertained of those people having been connected with the ancient inhabitants of Etruria: (Discoveries in Lycia p. 197) and he further states that "the nearest parallel to the domestic scenes [represented in the Lycian buildings] appears to be in the Etruscan paintings." (p. 252). Mr. Sharpe in the Memorandum appended to that work states that he was much struck with the great resemblance between the Lycian and the Etruscan letters; that the letters on various coins attributed to Cilicia have a still greater identity with those of Etruria; and further that the circumstance that it may be proved from a comparison of the Alphabets, that the Etruscans derived their character from Asia Minor and not from Greece, goes far to confirm the account given by Herodotus of their Lydian origin. No better authorities than the above can be quoted, and I feel convinced that an examination of the vases &c. brought from both countries which are to be seen in the British Museum can only tend to a similar conclusion.

The design of the Papers on the American Indians is to show that America was peopled from various parts of the Old World, and that the Caribs in particular came from Africa. This opinion is strengthened by an incidental remark by the German traveller Julius Frœbel respecting the similarity between a musical instrument called the *Marimba* which he notices as used in Nicaragua and there said to be of Indian origin, and an instrument of the same name and construction described by Livingstone as used in Angola and the neighbouring districts.

London, July 1861.

C. M. K.

ON THE ANCIENT LANGUAGES OF FRANCE AND SPAIN.

READ

BEFORE THE PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY

JUNE 22, 1855.

One of the earliest lessons taught us in our boyhood has left it indelibly impressed upon our recollections that ancient Gaul was divided into three parts, differing from each other in language, institutions and laws. Of these three parts, we were then taught that the Belgæ inhabited one, the Aquitani another, and that a people who called themselves Celts, but who by the Romans were called Gauls, inhabited the third. "Gallia est omnis divisa in partes tres, quarum unam incolunt Belgæ, aliam Aquitani, tertiam qui ipsorum linguâ Celtæ, nostrâ Galli appellantur. Hi omnes in linguâ, institutis, legibus inter se differunt."

From this commencement of his Commentaries, we might have expected that Cæsar would have next proceeded to inform us in what respects more especially these nations differed from each other. But in this expectation we are left disappointed, as whatever further particulars are given of them respectively, are given incidentally, so that it is from scattered and obscure notices of them only, we are enabled to form any conclusion as to the distinctions between them. True it is that we have no just reason to complain if we do not find all the precision of a philosophic historian in the narrative of a soldier recounting his exploits, especially as others who were professedly authors, Pliny for instance, and even Strabo, in giving us the same tripartite division of Gaul, enter still less explicitly into these particulars. But as the interest of the question is one more peculiarly of our times, it becomes the more requisite for us, from their omissions, to seek its solution from other considerations, — how far the inhabitants of the countries known to Cæsar as Gaul, may be connected with any people of the same nationalities representing them now.

I am not aware of any writer having entered at length

into this inquiry. Yet it is certainly one of much greater interest than the commentators on Cæsar have seemed to attach to it, as they have either passed over the subject altogether, or made such observations upon it as only served to show what little attention they had thought proper to give it. Thus, at length, we find one even accusing Cæsar of an error in the passage above cited, stating that his assertion of the difference of language was "not correct as regards the Belgæ and Celts, who merely spoke two different dialects of the same tongue, the former being of the Cymric, the latter of the Gallic stock. The Aquitani," it is added, "appear to have spoken a language of Iberian origin." Such are the views enunciated by the last commentator on Cæsar, Dr. Anthon, who has condensed in his notes the observations of previous writers; and as his edition seems now extensively admitted into our schools, it becomes so much the more important for us to examine the question whether this opinion may be considered correct.

The country occupied by the Belgæ, we are informed, was separated from that of the Celts or Gauls proper, by the Marne and the Seine. It consequently comprised, not only the modern kingdoms of Holland and Belgium, but also Flanders, Picardy, and a small portion of Normandy, with other provinces of modern France to the East. The inhabitants of these districts were the most powerful of all Gaul, as being on the one side the furthest removed from the Roman territories, they had been the least subjected to the evil consequences of a contact with them, and on the other being nearest to the Germans with whom they were always at war, they had their warlike habits kept in constant exercise. But we learn, moreover, that they were themselves of German origin, having, not long before Cæsar wrote, themselves intruded into their then possessions, after driving out thence the Gauls who were their former occupants. They were, therefore, clearly a different people from the Gauls, as being Germans, and consequently we may conclude that Cæsar was not mistaken respecting them and their language, inasmuch as we may well suppose them to have spoken one kindred to that of the Germans from whom they had sprung, and distinct from either the Cymric or Gaelic. Of that language, however, we have unfortunately scarcely any traces, or indeed any but the scantiest notices of the people themselves, but such as they are, they lead irresistibly to the conclusion which we should in reason deduce from the account of their origin, and from the subsequent history of the country they occupied.

In the earlier ages of the human race, when their numbers were yet few, and the whole world was before them where to choose the most eligible places for habitation, we may have no difficulty in imagining that many families might wander away so widely from their fellow men as to become completely isolated, growing up eventually into nations with languages, institutions, and social habits peculiar to themselves. As they so grew up into nations, the whole course of history shows us that they would become divided into minor sections, into opposite parties and contending factions, bearing upon one another in their own community and pressed upon by other branches of their family, or by other families which had also grown up into nations in like manner in adjacent countries. So long as the world afforded ample room enough for them to have places of refuge where to retire from more powerful parties, it was no great hardship for any weaker tribe to wander on, if thus pushed forward to the furthest confines of the habitable world. But in the course of such events, all the more eligible situations on the several continents would in no great length of time become occupied and eventually objects of contention, so that as the tide of population pressed on, the weaker parties would be compelled to retire to what would be otherwise ineligible situations, occupied only as the most inaccessible to their enemies.

At the time of Cæsar's conquest of Gaul, we learn that Britain had already become densely populated: "Hominum est infinita multitudo, creberrimaque ædificia;" and this must have been occasioned by the pressure of advancing population. At the same time the tribes on the main land who had not been able to cross the seas in search of securer abodes, were obliged to seek protection in such fastnesses as they could find, whether of mountainous districts or others. One tribe in that age amongst the Batavi thus seems to have already settled on the dubious lands since designated as the Low Countries, and given them the character they have ever since held as rescued from the ocean. It must have been the direst necessity alone that could have driven them into such abodes, and into adopting such means as even so early in their history the inhabitants had recourse to in their perilous situation for banking out the sea, and constructing their habitations beneath its approaches. Pliny, who wrote so shortly after Cæsar, describes their country in almost the same terms as we might employ in the present day, as a land where the ocean pours in its flood twice a day, and produces a perpetual uncertainty whether it should be considered

a part of the continent or of the sea (Hist. Nat. lib. xvi.). The whole passage is so graphic as to deserve a full citation: — "Sunt vero in Septemtrione visæ nobis Chaucorum qui majores minoresque appellantur. Vasto ibi meatu bis dierum noctiumque singularum intervallis, effusus in immensum agitur oceanus, æternam operiens rerum naturæ controversiam, dubiumque terræ sit an parte in maris. Illic misera gens tumulos obtinet altos, aut tribunalia structa manibus ad experimenta altissimi æstus, casis ita impositis navigantibus similes cum integant aquæ circumdata, naufragis vero cum recesserint: fugientesque cum mari pisces circa tuguria venantur. Non pecudem his habere, non lacte ali ut finitimis, ne cum feris quidem dimicare contigit, omni procul abacto frutice."

Such were the people in that age who, already pushed forward undoubtedly by others, whether to be called Teutonic or Germans, had entrenched themselves in the alluvial shores at the mouth of the Rhine, while others had been driven away to Britain or elsewhere. Some of the frontier tribes had perhaps amalgamated with, or settled down amicably among the neighbouring Gauls, keeping up however their national characteristics, as we find now for instance in the same country, at Brussels, people of different origin and speaking different languages living together. But already the inhabitants of that region seem to have belonged to the first tide of German population, pushed on by others of the same family, who had dispossessed the Gauls, the primitive inhabitants, and seized first the more eligible situations, and afterwards having sections occupying situations less desirable.

Among all nations we may observe that in the bordering districts of their respective countries there is an approximation of dialects, which some writers have imagined to be connecting links in the great social circle of the human race; but which, if they are so in reality, probably only originated from the meeting of different families after long separations, with the increase of population. The word 'races', as applied to the different families of mankind, has been so misused by some writers, that it seems to me preferable to adopt the latter term only in advocating the theory that different families, as the Celtic, the Teutonic, the Scandinavian, and the Slavonic, having originally grown up into different nations in distant lands with different languages, afterwards approached each other so intimately as to imbibe many of their respective peculiarities, sometimes mingling together in a friendly manner, and sometimes hostilely as conquerors and conquered. The main bodies of the several

families might diverge, while branches of them converged so as to become the connecting links between each other. Tribes of outcasts and fugitives or other offsets might be found separating from each principal trunk and meeting the like of other nations, so as to give rise to a variance of languages, which again would become divided into dialects, all showing more or less the connection originally existing.

Of such a nature seems to have been the mixture of people in Belgic Gaul in the time of Cæsar, which had been going on perhaps for many centuries previously. But the preponderating class then was clearly German, as being the conquerors, so that, according to the statement of Celsus, cited in Oudendorp, they refused to be called Gauls, and were indignant when they heard the name assigned them: — "Ut jam se Gallos dici nesciant, si audiant indignentur." The testimony of Cæsar, both directly and indirectly, in various parts of his Commentaries, and other ancient writers to the same effect, that the Belgians were of German origin, is so express and concurrent, that it becomes a matter of surprise to us to find it disputed. If however doubted by English writers, those of the country itself have no hesitation on the subject, and they seem to be unquestionably in the right. Whatever might have been the earlier divergences in the Teutonic family of nations, that branch of it settled in Belgic Gaul in the time of Cæsar, may well be expected to have retained substantially the language of their ancestors. When the Belgians first dispossessed the Gauls of those districts, they might have found them thinly populated, so that a new language might be easily introduced. But after they became more densely peopled, the language would be less affected by any new inhabitants. In such a case, the language grown up in any well-peopled country clings to it tenaciously. That which was learned in childhood cannot easily be erased from the memory of the adult population, and thus even conquerors have often had to adopt the language of the conquered.

We have no notices left us by which to form any sure conclusion as to the language of Belgic Gaul; but as far back as it can be traced, there seems to be no doubt of its having been nearly, if not entirely, the same as that existing at present, represented by the different dialects of Dutch, Friesic, Flemish, or Anglo-Saxon. That it did exist there in the time of Cæsar is clear, from the fact that there is no trace of its having been introduced subsequently, and as far as history or tradition reaches, it has always been the language of the country. Having no remnants of it in former

times given by any ancient writer, we can only have recourse to the names of places, of rivers, and such like, as then designated, and from these we can positively conclude them to originate from the same language to which their affinities refer at present. The names of towns are the least satisfactory of any, as there may be a doubt of the site of any one in the country. But the names of the rivers recorded by the Roman writers prove them to have then borne substantially the same names as those now in vernacular use. Thus the Rhenus or Rhein, the Scaldis or Scheldt, the Vahalis or Waal, the Mosa or Maese, the Visurgis or Weser, the Amisia or Ems, the Isela or Yssel, the Luppia or Lippe, the Albis or Elbe, the Granna or Gran, are, with scarcely an exception, names which the present inhabitants recognize as proceeding from or connected with their own language, while they present no indications of a Cymric or Gaelic origin. In the same manner we notice the names of some places connecting the former inhabitants with the present, distinct from the supposition of any Celtic origin. The Batavi seem to have left an indubitable trace of their name in Batawe, the Grudii in the Land Von Groede, the Bructeri in Broekmorland, and above all the Frisii, whose name as Freize is yet borne and recognized as their own by so considerable a portion of the people in the country.

Influenced no doubt by some such considerations, the continental writers, as already mentioned, have not hesitated in at once acknowledging the ancient Belgic language and nation to be represented by the people who now occupy their country. Malte Brun says (vol. i. p. 344), "The language of the Friesians never felt the shock caused by migrations. From the time of Cæsar to this very day, among the endless revolutions of nations, they have never changed their name or the place of their residence." In conformity with this also, Dr. Bosworth informs us that the most learned Dutch authors, as Erasmus, Junius, Dousa, Grotius, Scriverius, and others unite in the opinion of their nation being descended from the Batavi. Grotius asserts "that the ever-succeeding invaders of Insula Batavorum were swallowed up in the bulk of the Batavian population, and thus that the present Dutch are the genuine offspring of the Batavi." Dr. Bosworth adds, that "the Friesic, Dutch, and Flemish dialects were originally the same language. The Flemish is so allied to the Dutch, that it may, especially in its earliest forms, be considered the same." (Bosworth's Dictionary, p. xcvi.)

In opposition however to the opinions he had cited, Dr.

Bosworth observes, that the Romans had, in the course of their usual policy, drafted away the males from the country to be engaged in foreign wars, and that their place had to be filled up with strangers who he thinks must have varied the character of the people. Granting this in some measure to have been the case, still it may be considered very probable that the new comers were only people of the neighbouring tribes, speaking the same or some cognate language. Or even if they were others, yet it may be a question whether the language of the country could be materially changed unless the women had been taken away also. Cicero well observed, that the language of a country depended on the women, De Orat. iii. § 12, as also did Plato before him, Crat. § 74, and thus all history shows, that in a densely peopled country the completest conquest scarcely ever changes the language. That is only effected by an extermination of the former inhabitants, or by separating them into small sections in subjection to their masters. Whether the modern Dutch are the genuine descendants of the Batavi or not, is not the question for us to maintain. It will be sufficient for our purpose if it may be conceded that the language now spoken in Holland is the representative of that spoken in Belgic Gaul in the time of Cæsar, making due allowances for the different circumstances of the country at the respective epochs, influenced by the former state of barbarism contrasted with their present civilization.

Proceeding with the same line of argument, in the belief that where a language has once become firmly established in a fully-peopled country it remains permanently established, purely or recognizable in its derivatives or dialects, except under very peculiar circumstances, we can have little difficulty in next assigning to the nation whom Cæsar terms Celts or Gauls, the language now spoken in Brittany. In maintaining this opinion, the first difficulty we have to encounter is with regard to the name, as the people of that district who call themselves Bretons or Brezonec, do not recognize the name either of Gauls or Celts, the latter being that which, according to Cæsar, they acknowledged. In this, however, the difficulty is perhaps more apparent than real, and may be easily explained by referring to the relationship of what we may here for once call the Celtic nations one to another. This is in accordance with the common acceptation of the term, though there may be some doubt as to its strict correctness; inasmuch as these Celtic nations, generally understood as divided into two principal branches, the Cymric and Gaelic, have

languages entirely different from each other in their main characteristics, and in the construction of nouns and verbs, with a reservation to which I shall have afterwards to refer. In other respects they have their vocabularies remarkably similar. Whether therefore they ought to be considered of the same national origin appears to me somewhat questionable, but there can be no dispute of the fact of some very considerable admixture having taken place between them at some period of which we have no record.

That branch of the Celtic nation settled in England acknowledge the name of Cymry, but the Bretons of France ignore it, though their dialect is substantially the same as the Welsh. It follows hence that this nation had been also subdivided into two or more sections, the one in France calling themselves Bretons, who had probably sent colonies into England, to the shores adjacent, while the others, calling themselves Cymry, had had their dwellings elsewhere. Where that locality was we may reasonably conclude, from the account given us of the Belgic Germans having driven away the Gauls from the northern parts of Gaul, when their most obvious course was to take refuge in England, on the shores opposite. In corroboration of this assumption, we find accordingly, that though driven away from that locality, they still left their name attached to what is yet recognized as the Cimbric Chersonesus (Ptol. ii. c. 2; Tac. de Mor. Ger. c. 37); and even remnants of their population are said by Welsh writers to be yet traceable among the Wends of the North of Germany. If this be correct, they are probably a tribe of the same people as the Veneti mentioned by Cæsar, as they are said yet to speak a language having an affinity to those of Wales and Brittany, though so long separated from their brethren in those regions as to have adopted a different phraseology, in which the Slavonic element has become predominant. See Pughe's Welsh Dictionary.

In accordance with the same hypothesis, all our best writers on British antiquities, from Camden to the present day, show us that the Cymry evidently once inhabited all the eastern parts of England and Scotland; and it seems probable that they left their name finally in Cumberland, if not also elsewhere, when afterwards driven into Wales. When they settled upon this emergency in their present abodes, they probably met and amalgameted with their kindred tribes of Bretons, who were in like manner receding before the Saxons. It is certain that some Belgic Germans had also settled in England in the time of Cæsar, bringing with them, according to our argument, a dialect of that language,

which was afterwards termed the Anglo-Saxon. But the greater part of the people then inhabiting England came no doubt originally from Gaul, and were of the nation whom Cæsar describes as calling themselves Celts. The appellation of Gauls, which he says the Romans gave them, was one of very extensive application to a great number of tribes in different parts of Europe. Though he restricts the name to comparatively narrow bounds, other ancient writers speak of the Gauls as spread over the northern parts of Italy, as well as over France and Spain, and even Germany. Cæsar not only excludes, as it would seem, the Cisalpine Gauls from his enumeration of this people, but many of the Transalpine, and also those of that part of France designated The Province, while otherwise they appear to have been considered only cognate tribes. Without seeking to distinguish the notions entertained of them by different writers, it is the purport of this argument to show that Cæsar was correct in declaring those of the centre parts of France to have been distinct from those of the south-western or Aquitani, inasmuch as the former were of the Cymric family, and the latter of the Gaelic.

Originally distinct from each other, these two nations evidently seem to have passed through Europe by different routes, the Gaels through Greece, Italy, and the southern parts of France to Spain, while the Cymry came in a more northerly direction. If such were the case, the first tribes with whom the Romans came in contact were those of the Gaelic branch, whom Cæsar probably knew by their local names rather than by any general one. When these were asked respecting their neighbours and themselves, they would probably then, as their descendants now, return an answer which to Roman ears might be the cause of the confusion. In Gaelic the word *Gall* signifies a foreigner or people generally, and if used by them respecting their neighbours, the inhabitants of mid-France, the Romans would take it as Galli; but applied to themselves, they would probably then, as now, use a word of almost the same sound to strangers, *Gaël*, or as they please to spell it, *Gaoidhiol*. Thus the designation might easily be confounded by the Greek or Roman writers, who would therefore call them all alike Gauls, though the Cymry would be ignorant of the appellation applied to them.

In the same way respecting the term Celtic, which neither the Cymric nor Gaelic people acknowledge; the latter, speaktng of the country of either the one or the other, would probably use the word "*teach*," habitation, thus *Galteach* or

Gaelteach, whence the Greek and Roman writers could only make out a sound of Galtic or Celtic, and so apply that term to the people as if it were their national appellation. The general derivation of the term, however, is from the Cymric *celt*, *ceilt*, for covert or shelter, whence *celtiad*, or a dweller in coverts, or inhabitant of the woods; and this might also have given rise to the name applied to themselves, or both, as from both it would obtain a larger comprehension. But nothing is more confused in ancient history than the application by different writers of the names Gauls or Celts, evidently showing they had no distinct knowledge of the people, and that they used the names only as generic appellations. In a special inquiry as to the Celtic nations generally, it would be an interesting subject to enter into those various notices of the people who are sometimes spoken of as Celts and sometimes as Gauls; but that would lead us far beyond our present object, which is only to distinguish between the several nations of Gaul referred to by Cæsar.

Before proceeding to inquire into the differences between the Aquitani and the Gauls of mid-France, it may be necessary to revert to the difficulty already mentioned in making the discrimination as between the Cymry and the Gael, on account of the great similarity in the names of common objects in their respective languages. Thus then, where this similarity exists, it becomes impossible to refer to the one idiom or the other for the origin of the names of places and rivers, by which in ordinary cases, in the absence of any vocabulary, we might hope to trace their character. A great number of the names of rivers have thus a sound and meaning in common of Cymric and Gaelic origin, and the names of places also, whence it becomes very difficult sometimes to discriminate between them. Yet even here we are not entirely without some means of discrimination, as there are some variations sufficiently marked to guide us in our inquiry. The rivers of modern France, unlike those of Belgic Gaul, now bear names very different from their ancient names, which fact is a proof that the present inhabitants are a different people from those who dwelt there under the Romans. Thus the Marne and the Seine, called formerly Matrona and Sequana, seem to have in them compounds of the word pronounced Aon, both in Cymric and Gaelic, for a river, and the same with several others. On the other hand, several seem to have a reference only to the Cymric. The principal river of France, the Liger, now the Loire, appears to have its name derived from the language. *Llig*, 'what

shoots or glides,' and *aw*, 'water.' The Arar, now the Saone, is described as "a very slow and smooth running river," and Ara, Araf in Cymric, signifies "slow, soft, mild, still." The Atar, now the Adour, and the Duranius or Dordogne, with the Durance and some others, show combinations of the Cymric word *dwr*, 'water,' which though inserted in the dictionaries as Gaelic also, is not however in general use. In like manner several others might be judged to be Cymric, though I do not feel sufficiently decided respecting their probable derivations to claim them as of this language only.

The names of tribes afford less satisfactory means of judging, but a few instances may be found, as in the appelations Morini and Armorica, for the people or province on the seacoast: the word for sea in Cymric is *mor*, in Gaelic *muir*, whence we may conclude they derived their names from the former language, in which they have a signification of maritime, rather than from the latter. The names of several individuals among the different nations of Gaul are also given, some beginning with Ver or Vir, which may be explained from one language or the other; but as we are not generally informed what the names signified, all etymologies attempted respecting them must partake of a character of surmises only. One name however is defined, that of Vergobretus, as applied to the "chief magistrate" among the Ædui. This people, residing in the southern part of Gaul, according to the theory above set forth, were probably Gaelic, and in accordance with that theory, the chief magistrate or judge, "man for judgment," is clearly traceable in that language, "fear-go-breith," but not in the Cymric. The only other word which Cæsar has repeated is Soldurii, the name given to the band of warriors specially devoted to their chieftain (lib. iii. § 22). This word may be considered common to both the Cymric and Gaelic languages, Sawdior in the former, Saighaider in the latter, and both pronounced so much like the English word soldier, as to lead me to the conclusion of the latter being taken from one or both of the former, as so many other words have been derived from those sources of which our lexicographers seem to have no knowledge. Thus in the case of this same word soldier, different derivations have been given, while this early application of it has been entirely overlooked.

We must not however pass over another word, Ambacti, mentioned by Cæsar, without a direct intimation of its being Celtic, but which Festus says was a Gallic word for a hired servant, on the authority of Ennius: *δουλος μισθωτος ως Εννιος.* — Gloss. Ambactus. Cæsar, after speaking of the

Druids among the Celts, refers to their Equites, and says, "atque eorum ut quisque est genere copiisque amplissimus, ita plurimos circum se ambactos clientesque habet" (lib. vi. § 15). For this word then various derivations have been assigned by Celtic scholars; but passing them by as unsatisfactory, I would suggest, in consonance with our argument, that it should be sought in the Cymric, where accordingly we find still *amaeth*, 'a husbandman.' Cæsar, by the context entirely, and by the juxtaposition of *clientes*, clearly referred to the vassals generally of the Celtic nobles, probably as prædial or personal, and with this explanation the modern Cymric word perfectly agrees.

The French language itself is much more Celtic or Cymric than is commonly supposed. Many of its particles can only be properly understood by a reference to those idioms, and it contains many words taken from them. Those idioms, however, the Cymric and Gaelic, entered very largely into the composition of the Latin also; and when we find this the parent of so many existing modern languages, it becomes a somewhat interesting question to inquire how far that circumstance operated in spreading the Latin language itself. Systematic and unscrupulous as was the plan of colonization carried on by the Romans in connexion with their conquests, it may be a question whether they could have succeeded so completely in forcing their language upon different countries unless they had also found there languages with which their own could coalesce. We shall have to refer to a particular instance of this commingling of idioms hereafter, but at present return to what notices are left us of Gallic words, which are unfortunately very few.

Servius, in his Notes on Virgil (lib. ix. v. 743), mentions a circumstance from Cæsar's lost work 'Ephemerides,' that he had on one occasion been made prisoner by the Gauls, and being hurried away by his captors was met by one who knew him, and seeing him in that state called out in an insulting tone, Cæsar! Cæsar! This word, according to Servius, in Gallic signified *dimitte*; and the persons who held him prisoner, mistaking it as an order to release him, allowed him to escape. Dr. Anthon seems to consider this story apocryphal, and Celtic scholars have in vain attempted to find a word like Cæsar equivalent to *dimitte*. But it surely can be no valid reason for doubting the fact, because no such equivalent can be found. It is unreasonable to suppose that Servius would have repeated such a statement unless it had been first given by Cæsar, or that he would have deliberately recorded such an adventure unless it had really

occurred, especially when we may remove all difficulty respecting the word used, by understanding it somewhat of Cwswr or Cyswr, which in Cymric are terms of contempt. If those who held Cæsar prisoner understood one of their chiefs to say that he was a worthless captive, they might thus allow him to escape as undeserving of their trouble. This explanation seems to me more reasonable than to pronounce the anecdote apocryphal, and certainly the manner in which the circumstance is recited carries to the mind a full conviction of its truthfulness. "Hoc de historiâ tractatum est: namque Caius Julius Cæsar cum dimicaret in Galliâ et ab hoste raptus equo ejus portaretur armatus, occurrit quidam ex hostibus qui eum nosset et insultans ait Cæsar, Cæsar; quod Gallorum linguâ dimitte significat; et ita factum est ut dimitteretur. Hoc autem ipse Cæsar in Ephemeride suâ dicit, ubi propriam commemorat felicitatem," as he had good right to do.

Having already referred to the names of some rivers in mid-Gaul as deducible from the Cymric, it would be adviseable also, if feasible, to point out some of the towns or other places to whose names we might assign a similar origin. Knowing however the ridicule too often justly bestowed on etymologies, for which we have no clue or authority, and which are founded only on a fancied similarity or aptitude of meaning, I will confine myself to two instances, those of Novidunum and Lugdunum. These I take, not on account of their being more clearly explicable than several others, but because there were so many places called by each name as to indicate their origin from some particular local cause more than others. There were, in fact, three different places apparently of some importance bearing each of these names, and to one of them, Lugdunum, we have an explanation given us. Plutarch, or the author of the Treatise on Rivers, says, — *Μωμορος και Ατεπομαρος υπο Σεσηρονεως της αρχης εκβληθεντες εις τουτον κατα προσταγην τον λοφον πολιν κτισαι θελοντες· των δε θεμελιων ορυσσομενων αιφνιδιως κορακες επιφανεντες και διαπτερυξαμενοι τα περιξ επληρωσαν τα δενδρα. Μωμορος δ' οιωνοσκοπιας εμπειρος υπαρχων την πολιν Λουγδουνον προσηγορευσεν, λουγον γαρ τη σφων διαλεκτω τον κορακα καλουσι, δουνον δε τον εξεχοντα.* From this we learn, that on the foundation of what is now the city of Lyons an augury was taken from a flight of crows, in accordance with which the city was called Lugdunum, for that *loug* or *lougos* in their language signified a crow, and *doun* or *dunum*, an eminence. Now it is the case that *dun* in Gaelic, and *din* in Cymric, may be

explained as stated, but no word like λουγος in either at all approaches the appellation of any bird of the crow species. Had there then been only one town in Gaul so designated, we might have supposed that its name had been given from such a cause, and the original word become lost in either language, without being compelled to believe the cause assigned a mistake. But when we find three towns bearing that same name, we cannot possibly believe them all called after any crows, and would rather imagine the author had mistaken his information. He had heard of the augury having been taken, as usual in such cases, and he too hastily concluded that the word λουγ signified a crow. He had heard that the name was taken from two Gallic words, as *loug* and *doun*, and being correct with regard to the one, might easily fall into an error respecting the other. If it had not been for the direct statement of this author, and considering the position of the several places, we should have had no difficulty in deducing the name from *llwch* or *loch*, a lake or morass, and the common termination *dun*, signifying together a hill fastness in a lake or morass. Such we know to have been the places of security chosen by the Gauls for their towns or villages, and from such causes they would probably take their names. In the same way with regard to Novidunum, by which name three other cities were called, together with the usual termination *dun*, we might understand the Cymric *nodfa*, a sanctuary, a place of refuge and protection from their enemies, or even a city of refuge, if Celtic scholars will insist on the Druids having such sanctuaries.

The Druids seem to have been an institution of the Cymric rather than of the Gaelic people, though undoubtely their tenets had also spread extensively among the latter. Though Cæsar supposed them to have originated in Britain, their remains prove them to have flourished in an equal degree on the western shores of mid-France, as found especially in Brittany in our day. They had not advanced into Belgic Gaul, nor to any extent into Aquitania or Spain, and their deities may thus be understood by the Cymric rather than by the Gaelic language. Thus their god of eloquence, Ogmius, whom the Romans assimilated to Mercury, has his title explained by Irish scholars from their Ogam, "a secret letter," or "the secret of letters." If I might venture a suggestion, it seems to me better explicable from the Cymric *Ogmi*, from *Og*, "what is apt to open or expand, what moves or stirs, or is full of motion and life," and *mi*, the pronoun, or "what is identic." See the Welsh Dictionaries.

Taranis, in like manner, is evidently from the Cymric *taran* thunder, *taranu* to thunder, *taranydd* the thunderer. In Gaelic *torrun*.

Suetonius has informed us of another Gallic word which appears to me to have been also unsatisfactorily explained. He says that Cæsar raised a legion in Transalpine Gaul which he named Alauda, from a Gallic word, the meaning of which however he has not given. "Ex Transalpinis conscriptam, vocabulo quoque Gallico Alauda enim appellabatur" (lib. 1. § 24). Pliny, in a notice of this legion, also refers to this name Alauda as a Gallic word, but seems to connect it at the same time with the Latin name of a bird supposed to be the crested lark, as if from the crest of the helmet worn by the soldiers. "Paro volucris ex illo galerita appellata quondam postea Gallico vocabulo etiam legioni nomen dederat Alaudæ" (Hist. Nat. lib. ii. § 37). But Pliny's etymologies are generally bad, and in this instance, if he has not been misunderstood, it seems absurd to suppose that Cæsar would give such a name to his new legion. Looking at its composition, as raised of foreigners, I would suggest that it was probably taken from the Cymric word *allaid* foreign, to signify, therefore, the foreign legion. The word equivalent to this in Gaelic is *allmharach*.

In connexion with this, though wandering a little from the subject, I venture to suggest an explanation of the name Alemanni (Allemans in modern French), applied to the Germans, the derivations of which hitherto given seem very unsatisfactory. Without discussing them, however, I should pronounce it left by the Cymry, who might then have termed strangers and foreigners, as they now do, "Allmaon," a foreign people; whence the name might have become applied as a national, though at first it was only a general appellation. In the same manner we may explain the term Belgæ applied to the German intruders in the north of Gallia, who seem never to have acknowledged that name, and who, therefore, must have had it applied from some extraneous source. If we consider, then, their relative position to the Cymry, whom they drove from their possessions, we find its meaning in Cymric, where, from the roots *belg* a breaking out, *beli* havoc, devastation, we have Belgiad, still signifying a "ravager, or destroyer." Such was then, evidently, the name applied to their national enemies by the Cymry of old, as their descendants have afterwards, under similar circumstances, spoken of the Saesonaid.

Returning to our argument: it is thus our purport to show that the people of Gaul, termed by Cæsar Celts, were of the

same nation as the Cymry, which conclusion has been also come to by Thierry and other principal writers of France, though from other considerations. Our next task is to argue that the southern part of Gaul, or Aquitania, was inhabited by a Gaelic people.

It has already been stated, that though the Cymric and Gaelic languages, judging from their vocabularies merely, were kindred languages, yet in their essential particulars, as in their structure and framework, they are very different. At the same time, I reserved to myself the occasion for an important observation on this point, and it is this: though the Cymric and Gaelic languages are so entirely different in such essential particulars, — as between the idioms of Wales on the one hand, and those of Scotland and Ireland on the other, — yet the Breton of the present day is an intermediate one between them, and has many of its inflexions similar to the Gaelic. This is a very suggestive fact in the history of the language, and is such a one as serves well to explain the history of a people, where written records fail us. It has been already pointed out by Professor Duncan Forbes, in his interesting letters on the subject, first addressed to the 'Gentleman's Magazine,' though the cause is still left unexplained how this affinity should exist, after so many centuries have passed since any communication between the several countries could have possibly been had.

The modern Welsh have written records of acknowledged antiquity; and their Triads certainly seem to me entitled to credit. They are consistent with probability, and are free from all those extravagances which are the usual concomitants of fiction. They state expressly, that "the Cymri first settled in this island, and that before them no persons lived therein; but it was full of bears, wolves and bisons." They state, also, that "they consisted of three tribes, the Cymri, the Lloegrians, and the Brython, who were all of the same primitive race, and were of one language." — Williams's 'Ecclesiastical Antiquities of the Cymri,' p. 7. We learn further, from the same authority, that "the first came with Hu Gadarn (the mighty), because he would not possess a country and lands by fighting and persecution, but justly and in peace;" which seems to acknowledge, that he had been driven out of some former possession, and sought an uninhabited country for refuge. With these statements, so consistent with probability in themselves, we find all other authorities to concur. Tacitus says, "In universum tamen æstimanti Gallos vicinum solum occupasse credibile est; eorum sacra deprehendas, superstitionum persuasione; sermo

haud multum diversus." (Vit. Agr. cap. 2.) And the Venerable Bede: "Hæc insulâ Britones solum a quibus nomen accepit incolas habuit, qui de tractu Armoricano ut fertur Britanniam advecti, australes sibi partes illius vindicarunt." (Hist. Eccles. lib. i. cap. 1.) See Note.

These tribes, then, must have come to the eastern and south-eastern coasts of Britain, whence they would in due course proceed to the interior as their population increased. That such a people did once inhabit those coasts is deducible from the remnants of local names still remaining in England and Scotland. Of the Isle of Wight we find mention in Nennius, cap. 2: "Quam Britones insulam Guied vel Guith quod Latine divortium dici potest." There is no word like this that I can find with the same signification, except the Cymric Gwaheniaeth, which, pronounced quickly, has the sound of Guith. The names of rivers on those coasts also appear to be Cymric; and the application of the term Aber for the mouth of a river, prevalent on the east of Scotland, has been noticed by Professor Newman in his 'Regal Rome,' as unknown in other parts, where the Gaelic equivalent is Inver. While they were thus peopling the island on the one side, the Silures, whom Tacitus judged to have come from Spain, and other Gaelic tribes, also probably from Spain originally, were settling on the south-western and western. This will account for the evident traces of a Gaelic people having inhabited Wales previously to the Cymry, as Lloyd and other Welsh antiquaries have long since pointed out, and as also Prichard and other writers in our day agree. Thus, even now, "the inhabitants of North and South Wales are clearly two different races. Besides the distinction of dialect, there is a physiological difference" (Jones's 'Vestiges of the Gael in Gwynedd,' p. 72). And thus even "the natives of the extreme north and extreme south of Cardiganshire are not always mutually intelligible" (*ib.* p. 44); while the natives of North and South Wales respectively have dialects almost totally unintelligible to each other.

If, then, under these considerations, we suppose the Cymry to have been originally driven from the North of Gaul into Britain, before the more intimate communications arose that afterwards existed between their brethren in mid-Gaul and the Gael of Aquitania, we may easily account for the Cymric and Gaelic languages in these islands remaining comparatively distinct. But the Cymry in the centre of Gaul, associated more with the Aquitani, became more commingled with them, and adopted many of their inflections for nouns

and verbs, as well as many of their primitive words, so as to make the Breton, as before observed, an intermediate language. Hence it happens in the present day, a Welshman and Irishman speaking their vernacular tongues cannot understand one another in the least; but the former can understand the Breton with little difficulty, and the Irishman can understand him also, though with greater difficulty. This circumstance shows there has been a great commingling of the two nations at some former time; and we know historically it cannot have occurred within at least a thousand years, so that occurring so long since, and remaining so distinctly to be noticed, it must have been of the most intimate character. This can only be accounted for by the hypothesis of the two families having lived close to each other in Gaul for a very long period of time; which consideration leads us to the next question, whence we draw this conclusion, that the Aquitani, their neighbours of the South of France, were Gaelic.

The language of the Aquitani is as much a matter of discussion as either of the others. Had we any considerable data respecting any of them from which to deduce a decided opinion, these would necessarily form a part of their history, and not leave us any question for argument as a problem to be solved. As it is, we must be content with what few hints have been afforded us, combined with the probabilities of the case to support our theory. Of Gallic or Celtic words we have many notices in ancient writers to have them identified with the living languages; but the real question is, how to connect them with any particular part of Gaul. The names of rivers or places here assist us a little, on account of the number of words, as above mentioned, common to both the Cymric and Gaelic languages. Hence it is we find so many of the rivers of the Peninsula, Abono or Avono, the Douro, the Duero, and others apparently of the same common origin. There is, however, one termination connected with different divisions of the country deserving of our notice, — Tan or Tania, common to the Aquitani and many of the tribes of Spain; Lusitani, Laretani, Cosetani, Varetani, Edetani, Contestani, Bastatani, Orretani, Turdetani. This termination seems to have been unknown in mid-Gaul, with the exception, perhaps, of Pliny's 'Britanni,' and it has no meaning in Cymric. But it has a significant meaning in Gaelic, *tan*, *tana*, *tania* signifying a district or country; so that Aquitania may thus be understood as the country of the Aqui, whatever might be the origin of that name. This, however, like most national

names, must remain a conjecture merely, for the explication of which we have no clue; as that given by Pliny, evidently from the Latin *aquæ*, seems to me altogether unsatisfactory. Of the language of the Aquitani I know of only one word left us, that given by Suetonius, who says that at Tolosa *Bec* signifies the beak of a bird: "Cui Tolosæ nato cognomen in pueritiâ Becco fuerat; id valet gallinacei rostrum" (lib. viii. § 18). This word is Gaelic, not Cymric, where the equivalents are *pig*, *gylfin*, *gylfant;* nor is it Basque, in which language the equivalent is *ontzia*.

This is unfortunately only one word to guide us. But even if we could adduce a number of words, the conclusion would be little conformable with the views we have maintained, as we have observed that the Gaelic and Cymric vocabularies have many equivalents in common, while the framework of the two languages proves them to be essentially distinct. Thus, in the modern languages of France and England, their vocabularies might be made to show them to be essentially the same, while the grammars would prove them to be of entirely different origin. Such conclusions, then, are very unphilosophical, as often leading to error; though still, in the absence of fuller proofs, we may take them as evidences in our favour, so far as they are worth it, to support our assumption, even if they are not considered sufficient to prove them. This assumption is, that the Gaelic tribes having come at different periods from Spain into Ireland, whence a colony of them afterwards went into North Britain under the name of Scots, the language now spoken in Ireland and Scotland, and known as Gaelic, is the representative of that formerly spoken in Aquitania and Spain.

The accurate and judicious Strabo has taken care twice to inform us explicitly, that the Aquitani resembled more the Iberi, or people of Spain, than they did the other Gauls; not in language only, but also in personal appearance: *Τους μεν Ακυιτανιους τελεως εξηλλαγμενους ου τη γλωττη μονον αλλα και τοις σωμασιν εμφερεις Ιβηρσι μαλλον η Γαλαταις* (lib. iv. § 1). And again, *Απλως γαρ ειπειν οι Ακυιτανοι διαφερουσι του Γαλατικου φυλου κατα τε τας των σωματων κατασκευας και κατα την γλωττην εοικασι δε μαλλον Ιβηρσιν* (*ib.* § 2). This being our guide, the next question arising for consideration is, to inquire what was the language of Spain at that period.

In the passage first above cited, Strabo further gives us to understand, that among the Gauls, distinct from the Aquitani, there were several dialects, or slight differences of lan-

guage. But even without this information, only from the probability arising from what we observe in all countries, we might have judged that such would have been the case. The same with regard to the people of Spain, of the original inhabitants, independently of the various foreigners that had settled there, Greeks, Romans, Phœnicians, Carthaginians, or any others, including the Persians, according to Varro, as cited by Pliny. What people were referred to as Persians, it is unnecessary here to conjecture, as our inquiry is only directed to ascertain the character of that large and warlike body of wandering tribes whom the more civilized nations of antiquity found in Spain, as recorded by their writers. These tribes, spoken of by them under different names, were, as far as we can judge, of the same origin in Spain; though not, as Gibbon has said, all the same as those of Gaul and Britain. When, therefore, we read of the people of Spain under so many different names as Gauls, Celts, Scythians, or Iberi, with the compounds Celtiberi, or Celto-Scythians, independently of the local names, or those of individual tribes, we must not imagine them to have been of distinct nationalities. Strabo has expressly informed us, that these were all only general terms: and his observations respecting them are deserving of our careful consideration: *φημι γαρ κατα την των αρχαιων Ελληνων δοξαν ωσπερ τα προς Βορραν μερη τα γνωριμα ενι ονοματι Σκυθας εκαλουν η Νομαδας ως Ομηρος υστερον δε και των προς εσπεραν γνωσθεντων Κελτοι και Ιβηρες η συμμικτος Κελτιβηρες και Κελτοσκυθαι προσηγορευοντο υφ' εν ονομα των καθεκαστα εθνων ταττομενων δια την αγνοιαν* (lib. i. cap. 2).

From the above passage we may conclude, that Strabo understood the term Scythians to signify Nomades; and such, literally, seems to be the true meaning of the word, whether applied to the wandering tribes known to the ancients as Scythians, or those known later as Scots, the word Scuite in Gaelic still signifying a wanderer. We have already seen that the word Celt seems to have been applied with the same meaning as a bushranger, or dweller in the woods; and corresponding to these, though certainly a new suggestion, I feel persuaded that the word Iberi had the same signification, and was applied to the same people by the Phœnicians, from whom it came to the Greeks and Romans. The word עִבְרִי, which we have in our version translated Hebrew, appears originally to have signified one who had no fixed habitation: עֲרָבִים, "inhabitants of the desert, nomades." Thus the phrase in Genesis, ch. xiv. 13, in our

version translated "told Abram the Hebrew," is rendered in the Septuagint *Αβραμ τῳ περατῃ*; and thus also, in other parts of the same version, by other terms of equivalent signification, as *εκβαινοντες* and *διαπορευομενοι*, in the 1st book of Samuel. From this, then, we may judge, that the same general term which had been applied by the Phœnicians to the Israelites, and to the wandering tribes of the country now known as Georgia, had been also applied by them to those they found in Spain, and had come to the Greeks and Romans as a national appellation. However this may be, it is certain that the name Iberi was applied by Greek and Roman writers to the people inhabiting Spain in their times, and that these Iberi were not any former class of inhabitants, but essentially the same people who were by others of those writers also called Gauls, Celts, Scythians, or Celtiberians.

The Irish histories and traditions are mixed up with so many palpable fictions, that it is impossible for us in reason to rely on them as authorities. Still, so far as they may be received, they show us that the first inhabitants of Ireland came from Spain; and certainly that important branch of them, the Scots, who first gave their name to that island, and afterwards to North Britain, as in the present day. The traditions and histories of Spain on this point coincide with the Irish, and so also do the English (see Nennius, § 13), so that we have both authority and probability in support of our assumption. We have already cited Strabo as noticing the personal resemblance of the Aquitani to the people of Spain; and Tacitus, for the same reason, judged the Silures of Wales to have been of Spanish origin. Such national resemblances are well worthy of remark; and thus, even now, after the lapse of 2000 years, there may be traced an extraordinary similarity of personal appearance between the lower classes of the Irish and those of Galicia in Spain, whence the colonists are said to have proceeded. To that province the Gael left their name, and there the coast is yet designated Brigantina. Thence, also, the slightest observation of the map will show, that any vessel, sailing even at random, would as easily get to Ireland as to the south-western parts of England, where others of their family had no doubt settled in the same manner. This being allowed, the conclusion necessarily follows, that the original colonists took their language with them; and as they have ever since remained a distinct people in Ireland, have thus been able to retain it.

Spain itself was subjected so relentlessly to the systema-

tic colonization of the Romans, that the original inhabitants of the country seem to have been soon completely absorbed in the communities of their conquerors. Thus, then, their language seems soon to have become obliterated, so that, even in the earlier periods of the empire, Latin had entirely superseded it. But still some traces of that ancient language are yet to be found in modern Spanish, — words such as *garzon*, a boy; *nada*, nothing; *casaca*, a coat, and a few others, which, having no affinities in Latin, Basque, or Cymric, are purely Gaelic. In like manner other traces are to be found in the pronunciation of a still larger class of words, which appear to have first come to the Latin also from the Gaelic. Thus a thief is not *latro*, but *ladron*, which is Gaelic and Cymric; and the wall of a house, in like manner, is *pared*, not *paries*. *Terra* becomes *tierra*, from the Gaelic *tir; planus* is *llano*, pronounced *liano*, Gaelic, *leana; plenus* is *lleno*, pronounced *liano*, Gaelic *lianum; mel* is *miel*, Gaelic *mil; ferrum* is *hierro*, Gaelic *iarrun*, with many others.

Several words, said to have been taken from the ancient Spanish language, have been handed down to us; but they are not easy to be identified with any living language: *briga*, a town; *buteo*, a bird of rapine; *cetra*, a shield; *cusculia*, a kind of oak; *dureta*, a seat in a bath; *falarica*, a kind of spear; *gurdus*, stolidus; *lancia*, a lance; *necy*, a name for the god Mars, and perhaps a few others. Of these *lancia* and *cetra* appear to be certainly Gaelic; *dureta*, from *dwr* or *dur*, may be Gaelic and Cymric; *gurdus* is the same as the Cymric *gordew;* the others I cannot trace satisfactorily to myself in either of those languages, nor yet in Basque. Perhaps further researches may afford some explication of them, or the statements made respecting them may have been made erroneously, or the words themselves may have become lost in the languages as now remaining.

In conclusion, we have it still left us to consider the question whether the singular language now generally known as the Basque or Biscayan, can be supposed to have been the prevalent language of Spain in the time of Cæsar or Strabo. William Humboldt and many other writers have held that the people speaking it were the original inhabitants of Spain prior to the arrival of the Celts, and that they had probably come from Africa. The modern Basques have also some traditions or belief to the same effect, maintaining that their ancestors had come direct from the plains of Shinar, at the time of the dispersion under Tubal Cain. In this absurdity they have persuaded several others of the

Spanish writers to concur, though Mariana and the most judicious of the Spaniards have dissented from them. On the other hand, M'Culloch in his 'Geographical Dictionary' and Borrow in his 'Bible in Spain,' say that some of the Basques believe themselves to be the remnant of some Phœnician colony. Beyond these assertions, I have never met with any Basque to assent to this supposition, though I have conversed with many intelligent persons of their country on the subject; nor have I found any such suggestion in the principal works written on their language; of which I believe I have nearly all that have ever been published. I have never met with the one purporting to explain the celebrated passage in Plautus, generally considered Phœnician, by means of the Basque language, but feel confident, from the consideration I have given it, that however ingeniously the attempt might have been made, it could not have succeeded in proving any connexion between the Basque and the language of that passage.

It seems to be an opinion almost universally admitted that the Phœnician language was nearly identical with the Hebrew. If this opinion be correct, though wishing to be understood as not altogether agreeing with it, we may positively assert that the Basques cannot be supposed to be any remnant of the Phœnician colonists, as there are very few traces indeed of Hebrew to be found in their language. Still it appears to me very probable that they are the descendants of some colony from the East planted in the districts which they now occupy, the traces of which are clearly to be seen, and are well deserving of being investigated. They certainly give no indications of being descendants of the original inhabitants of the Peninsula. They speak of their neighbours, the French and Spaniards respectively, by appellations merely signifying people of the country, or natives (Erdederac); and of themselves as people of their respective provinces, without any trace of hostile feeling such as might be expected if they had ever in reality been driven from other possessions. They call themselves Euscaldunac, and their language Euscara, totally ignoring the name of Basques, by which they are generally known. On the contrary, they rather understand the term as applicable to other people, the word *basa* in their language signifying a wood, and *basacoa* a dweller in the woods. This term they applied to the people now known as Gascons, who are descendants of people who formerly lived in their neighbourhood, but were afterwards driven into France. These Gascons have no affinity whatever with the Euscaldunac, but

an unmistakeable affinity with the Gael, so that the application of the name to them is strictly appropriate, while the reflex of it on the Euscaldunac themselves can only be considered a striking example of the perversity with which national appellations are sometimes conferred.

William Humboldt has further attempted to show that this people had formerly been spread very extensively over Spain, from the names of places that may be explained by means of their language. In this, however, he appears to me overstraining his facts for the sake of his theory, as in reality there are but few such names that can be allowed to be so derived, and those principally on the sea-coasts. In fact the original location of the Basques can scarcely be traced beyond their present limits, the provinces of Biscay, Guipuzcoa, and Alava in Spain, and the sea-coast of France from the Pyrenees to Bayonne. If they ever extended further, it appears to me that it was not in the interior but along the sea-coasts; as further on in Spain there is another Bayona, which is one of the most certain of their appellations, from *ibaya* river, and *ona* good.

There is no nation in the world more remarkable for industry and enterprise than the Basque, combined with such a pure love for their country and their free institutions, while crime seems almost unknown in their provinces. A celebrated modern Spanish writer, Lista, has recorded of them that he resided upwards of three years among them, and never heard of any offence committed there during that time beyond an assault from motives of jealousy. Thus a brave, frugal, sober and industrious people, spreading themselves over Spain and Spanish colonies, we may decidedly pronounce them to be an increasing rather than a decreasing people. Yet in the present day they are in their native provinces only very few in number, — under half a million of souls altogether. From these considerations, and from their whole history, they appear to me to have increased to that number from some small colony rather than to have decreased from a larger nation. Their history, and language, which is quite distinct from any other in the neighbourhood, deserve a much more careful investigation than has yet been given them, and perhaps the former can now only be elucidated by means of the latter. This investigation, however, would require a lengthened inquiry, and is entitled to form the subject of an entirely distinct notice. At present, I content myself with saying that I agree with those of the Spanish writers, Florez and others, who consider them to have been a different people from the Cantabri. These were pro-

bably of the same tribe as the Cantii, the primary inhabitants of our county of Kent.

Of the other settlers in Spain it is unnecessary here to speak, as the purport of this essay has been only to discuss the question of the language spoken by the original inhabitants of the country in connexion with the Aquitani. They undoubtedly spoke among themselves, as we are also told they did, a variety of dialects such as we find the case in all countries and all ages. Among the Basques there are seven, and among the Gael and Cymry full as many. This, however, is not inconsistent with our argument, that the ancient inhabitants of Spain were Gaelic, of the same family of people as the Aquitani of France, who were distinct from the inhabitants of what Cæsar calls Celtic Gaul, the latter being of the Cymric family, while both were distinct from the Belgæ, inasmuch as these were Germans.

NOTE.

P. 17. — I pass over, as inadmissible, the later suppositions of the Armoricans having come originally from Cornwall when driven away by the Saxons. A few refugees might have then settled there among a kindred people, but we cannot suppose them to have been the first of their family settled in that district.

ON THE ETHNOLOGY AND CIVILIZATION OF THE ANCIENT BRITONS.

READ

BEFORE THE ETHNOLOGICAL SOCIETY

JULY 8, 1857.

The spirit of philosophical enquiry which has characterized the researches of so many later writers on the ancient histories of Greece and Rome does not seem to have extended its influence over those who have had to refer to the ancient history of our own island, though on this subject we might certainly have expected to find as favourable a consideration given, and as discriminating a judgment evinced, as on any questions relating to the more renowned nations of antiquity.

In other countries which have been subjected to the sway of such ruthless conquerors as the Romans, the national writers of succeeding ages have almost uniformly exhibited a generous feeling of commiseration for the fate of the conquered. They have exalted their good qualities and palliated their reverses. But English writers, at least those of a later date, seem on the contrary actuated by a perverse determination to describe the ancient inhabitants of this island as if they had been unquestionably entirely irreclamiable savages, though the accounts given of them by the first conquerors themselves afford the most conclusive contradictions to such a supposition.

Poets may perhaps be allowed the license of exaggeration; but when we find the most popular of our modern historians writing of the first known inhabitants of this island as "little inferior to the Sandwich islanders" and as capable of receiving only "a scanty and superficial civilization from the Romans" it becomes well worthy of enquiry whether these representations are correct? And then further whether the Romans did not in the conquest of this island overthrow a

nascent civilization, which though distinct from that of Rome might of itself have attained a no less remarkable development under happier circumstances.

Such are the questions I now propose for your consideration. But before entering on them it seems to me advisable to enquire who were the people inhabiting the island when it first became known to the Romans, and what were their respectively different nationalities.

The early history of man is little more than a history of his migrations, and all tradition and observation show that those migrations have been proceeding in the same course from the first periods. Whatever might have been the impelling motive, whether from the natural restlessness characteristic of uncultivated tribes, or from internal dissensions in a state, or on account of the inroads of foreign invaders, we find wave after wave, if we may use the expression, of the several tides of population flowing on in a continued stream. Thus we find the people inhabiting any particular country at a stated period often very different from those who inhabited it at a preceding or a subsequent period, and hence with reference to such people the Ethnologist and scholar must enquire primarily who they were and whence they came.

These observations however apply principally to the first periods of population. When mankind only numbered a few families or tribes and the world was all before them where to choose their habitations, it was a matter of little moment where they determined to abide. But when their numbers increased so much that not only were the best localities crowded, but also the less eligible were densely occupied, then came the struggle for the more favourable settlements, and contests and conquests arose to arrest the attention of the historian, and excite the curiosity of the enquirer in after ages. For then came the amalgamation of different nations, and the formation of different languages, the elucidation of which forms one of the chief and most interesting duties of the Ethnologist.

In this manner various different nationalities have swept across the whole extent of the globe, and especially over Europe, as we know it, have left traces more or less distinct of their progress. Where the countries were thinly populated, the conquered or expelled first possessors would naturally leave few or no perceptible traces; but where they had been more densely peopled, it would be almost out of the power of any conqueror to efface all traces of the former inhabitants.

Passing by as entirely unworthy of notice the theories of those who have written or talked about autochtones and different creations of primitive men, the first probability which suggests itself to every one who thinks rationally on the question of the earliest population of Britain is that it must have proceeded from the neighbouring continent. The earliest writers assume it as an indisputable fact, as the Venerable Bede (Hist. Eccles. lib. i. cap. 1) and Tacitus long before him who gives as a reason, that they resembled them in form and manners and had the same religion, and a language somewhat similar. In universum tamen æstimanti Gallos vicinum solum occupasse credibile est; eorum sacra deprehendas, superstitionum persuasione; sermo haud multum diversus." (Vit. Agric. cap. 2). This conclusion indeed is so palpable that it requires only further to be proved not so much of the fact itself as of the particular people at the period to which we refer. The question then arises for us to decide who were the people inhabiting the neighbouring parts of Europe at the period when Britain first became known to the Romans.

All the principal writers of antiquity whose works have reached us on the subject, such as Cæsar, Strabo and Pliny agree in dividing ancient Gaul into three principal divisions, Belgic, Celtic and Aquitaine. But while each enumerates many different nations or tribes in the several divisions, Cæsar alone describes the people of the three great divisions as distinct from each other in language, institutions and laws. Hi omnes in linguâ, institutis legibus inter se differunt. (De Bello Gall. lib. i. § 1.) Thus while the Geographer and the Naturalist leave unnoticed such an important and interesting fact, the Soldier alone informs us there were three distinct nationalities, of which the tribes severally mentioned were only fractional members. The Belgæ, Cæsar further tells us, were for the most part of German origin, a people who had driven away the Gauls the former occupants of the country. Sic reperiebat plerosque Belgas esse ortos a Germanis, Rhenumque antiquitus traductos, propter loci fertilitatem ibi consedisse, Gallosque qui ea loca incolerent expulisse. (De Bello Gall. lib. 2. § 4.). Of these Belgæ then as the first in order, we will first endeavour to trace their subsequent affinities.

After the information Cæsar gives us of the Belgæ having been mostly of German origin, who had driven away the Gauls the former inhabitants of the country, we may be well prepared to learn from Celsus (as quoted by Oudendorp) that they refused to be called Gauls and would be

indignant if they were called so. Ut jam se Gallos dici nesciant, si audiant indignentur. They also seem to have equally ignored the name of Belgæ, which therefore we may presume to have been a name given them by some other people who had communicated it to the Romans. Supposing this other people to have been Gauls or Celts of the Cymric branch, now represented by the inhabitants of Wales and Brittany, and supposing these were the people who had been expelled from their ancient possessions, then we might expect to find in their language some traces of the origin of the name. Turning then to this language we accordingly find the roots *beli*, *belg* to ravage or destroy, and the substantive *Belgiad*, ravagers or destroyers. In fact the Belgians stood to the neighbouring Celts or Gauls in the relation of invaders, ravagers and destroyers, and formed the first eruption of those roving tribes who subsequently became better known to history as Angles or Săxons or Anglo-Saxons.

The languages which have been spoken of and considered by many as if distinct under the names of Anglo-Saxon, Flemish, Friesic, Dutch or Low-German were in fact only dialects of one and the same language, which language we may conclude to have been spoken in Belgic Gaul in the time of Cæsar from this consideration, that though we cannot trace it up to that very date yet we can trace it up so remotely as to show that it could not have been introduced there at any intermediate period. No other people had come there to supplant them or change their language, and thus we find Dutch writers so impressed with its antiquity as to ascribe it unhesitatingly to the Batavi and one even to claim for it the honor of having been spoken in Paradise. Without discussing the validity of this claim, we may be content with admitting the other, and then the question next arises for us to consider who were the people driven away by the Belgæ and what became of them.

In this enquiry we must again resort to Cæsar who informs us they were Gauls, by which name he seems to have spoken especially of the inhabitants of Mid-Gaul, now represented by the people of Brittany or Bretons who speak a language almost identical with the modern Welsh or Cymric. Those then who formerly inhabited Belgic or North-Gaul, and who had been thence expelled by the Germans, can be supposed to have had only two courses open to them to escape from their invaders, either to fall back on their kindred in Mid-Gaul or to fly to this island. Of these two probabilities, the latter may be taken as the most probable,

as Mid-Gaul may be easily assumed to have been already densely occupied and this island comparatively if not entirely uninhabited.

It would however be highly unphilosophical to rest on mere probabilities and assumptions, and we will therefore in accordance with the rules of our Science of Ethnology proceed to show that this must certainly have been the course adopted from every consideration and conclusion which the Science exacts in its reasonings. The argument we undertake to prove is that the modern Cymri or Welsh are the representatives of the renowned Cimbri who so nearly overthrew the rising greatness of Rome, and notwithstanding the ridicule cast on such a supposition by even such an authority as Niebuhr proceed to prove it not only by 1st the probability referred to, but also 2nd by historical references; 3d by traces of the language left in the country whence they were so driven, 4th by traces of the fact in the country to which they fled, and 5th by the traditions yet existing in this country of a character to be relied on and such as in reality to amount even to history. —

1. Proceeding on the basis of probability that the people of the opposite shores of the Continent were those who first came to inhabit this island, we come next to show from historical references that those peoples on the Continent were the remnants of the Cimbri so renowned in history, and that the modern Cymri or Welsh are of kindred descent.

2. Strabo on the authority of Posidonius connects the Cimbri with the ancient Cimmerians on the Mæotic lake and alleges them to have traversed through Europe in arriving at its western shores, naming the Boii who gave their name to the country of Bohemia as part of their nation. Plutarch in his life of Marius on the authority of ancient writers whom he does not name adopted the same history. If this were the case they must have been a numerous and powerful people swelling on in the course of population until they arrived at the western limits of the Continent after which they either from choice or necessity precipitated themselves upon the South of Europe and finally were nearly exterminated by the arms or policy of Marius.

Two centuries nearly had elapsed when Strabo wrote since the Cimbri had entered Italy and carried dismay and disgrace to the very gates of Rome. There is an intimation given by him that they had been driven out of their own country by an inundation, and as this is not an improbability considering the nature of the country, we may understand the motive of such a movement of almost the whole

nation to the South. Under the influence of such a necessity we may almost say of despair, they had defeated four consular armies and driven a fifth panic-struck before them when they were eventually met and destroyed by the skilful tactics of C. Marius. Notwithstanding however the usual vaingloriousness attending the Roman announcements of their victories, it seems clear that Marius owed his success more to his policy than his prowess. He entrenched himself in a position where the Cimbri could not attack him, and it must have been only when they had consumed all their provisions, and had become disorganized and were wandering about destitute seeking forage that he attacked them at a disadvantage and destroyed them in detail. In no other way can we conceive how the Romans with only the loss of 300 men as they pretend could have massacred 100,000 or more of those who had so often and so signally defeated other Roman armies.

Previously to this fatal reverse the Cimbri had wasted their strength in several fruitless encounters both in Gaul and Spain where they also seem to have planted various colonies, or where scattered bands perhaps afterwards settled. Those who escaped the Romans may thus have led a wandering and precarious life, seeking to return to their own homes, where at length by the favor of the Emperor Augustus the remnants of their nation were at length permitted to return. Strabo informs us specifically ofthis fact and says that in his time they possessed their former country *και γαρ νυν εχουσι την χωραν ην ειχον προτερον* lib. 7. p. 293 adding they held Augustus in the highest honor for the favor thus shown them. Cæsar says that the Aduatuci in Belgic Gaul were descended from the Cimbri and Teutones who in their way to Italy had left their heavy bagage there behind with 6000 men to guard it lib. 2. § 29. Every other ancient authority coincides in declaring that great peninsula extending from the Elbe to the North Sea as the original seat of the Cimbri from whom it obtained the name of the Chersonesus Cimbrica. Pliny calls it Promontorium Cimbrorum excurrens in maria longe peninsulam efficit. H. N. iv. 27. Ptolemy l. 2. c. 11 and P. Mela lib. iii. c. 3 speak of it in similar terms and Claudian iv. 335 calls the North Sea the Cimbric Sea. Finally, Tacitus says in his time the Cimbri held the shore of Germany nearest the Ocean, — now a small state but of exceeding glory. Eundem Germaniæ sinum proxime Oceano Cimbri tenent, parva nunc civitas sed gloria ingens. Tac. De Mor. Ger. c. 37.

All history therefore proves that the renowned Cimbri

were the original inhabitants of the western shores of Europe opposite to our island, and though the main force of the nation had been wasted in the invasion of the South of Europe and though other nations had for many years pressed upon the remnant of them the Aduatuci, as Cæsar says in the consequent weakness of their condition, yet a certain portion of them was still left by which they may be identified.

3. Having thus shown that the Cimbri formerly inhabited the opposite shores of the continent, to connect them with the modern Cymri or Welsh we have next to show the traces which they if Cymri left there. Remembering Cæsar's statement that the Belgians were for the most part of German origin and the statements of later writers that a small portion of the Cimbri still continued to be found there we have here another instance of the fact that no conquering nation ever entirely extirpates the conquered. They only destroy those who have offered or can offer an effectual resistance, and they preserve the women and others useful to them as slaves. Thus among every conquering people there is always left a remnant of the conquered who infuse some portion more or less of their language and manners among their masters. Accordingly all the continental writers expressly acknowledge the fact that words common to the Celtic tribes occur in the Danish of Jutland and in the Frisian and Low-German of Sleswick and Holstein (see Transactions of the Philological Society Vol. i. p. 190) and several learned writers are investigating at the present time with great assiduity the affinities of the Old Friesic with the Celtic which are so remarkable that it would be difficult to say how they can be explained otherwise than in the way I have suggested.

There is however a still more decided proof to be adduced. Tacitus informs us that there was a people in the North of Germany in his time who spoke the same language as the British. That people seem to have inhabited the country now inhabited by the Wends who are generally supposed to be a branch of the Slavonian family speaking a dialect of the Slavonian language. But their name betokens some affinity to the Cimbri or Cymri as the Veneti were a principal people of Celtic Gaul in Cæsar's time having intimate relationship with the ancient Britons, and Gwynedd the modern Welsh name for Wales is apparently of kindred origin. If this supposition were rightly founded we might accordingly expect to find, as we actually do find, in the Wendish language as now spoken far off from us on the

banks of the Elbe so strong an infusion of the Cymric that Welsh scholars of whose good faith we have no more reason to doubt than of their ability, as Owen, Parry and others unreservedly claim the Wendish as a dialect of the Welsh, as well as the Armoric or the language spoken in Brittany. Whether their statements can be fully verified or not, is of little consequence as it will be sufficient for my argument that there are any traces of Celtic in their language at all.

The Armoric as I said before I consider to be the representative of the language spoken in Celtic or Mid-Gaul in Cæsar's time, and respecting its affinity to the modern Cymric or Welsh on the one hand and to the modern Gaelic or Irish and Scotch on the other I shall have soon to make some observations. At present having I trust satisfactorily shown you from traces left there, that a Cymric people formerly occupied the western shores of Europe, I proceed to argue that a portion of them on being driven away from thence came to the Eastern shores of this island as their first place of refuge.

4. The Cymri now it is well known only inhabit the mountainous district of the West of this island or the country we call Wales. But according to the argument I have undertaken to maintain they first occupied the Eastern shores whence they were driven to the West, we have therefore now to follow the traces they left of that occupation.

In Cæsar's time the maritime parts or seacoasts of Britain were already inhabited by the Belgæ, who not content it seems with driving out the Celts or Gauls from their former country had thus followed them into this island and were encroaching upon them here. (Lib. 5. c. 10.) Thus even then there seems to have begun to be spoken in England a dialect of that language which was afterwards known among us as Anglo-Saxon, and now represented by that "in which Shakespeare and Milton wrote and which wise Bacon and brave Raleigh spoke." Before however this could have encroached materially upon the Cymric in England, an evil had befallen the people here which had not fallen so disastrously on their kindred on the Continent, and that was the exterminating influence of Roman conquests.

The Romans did not penetrate at all beyond the Rhine and never occupied Belgic Gaul in the manner in which they trampled over Britain; consequently the traces left in Belgic Gaul of the Cymri may be thus even more distinct there than in the East of Britain, though both countries were equally afterwards subjected to the invasions of the countless tribes which Germany, the officina gentium, sent forth

in succeeding ages. Still we are not without sufficiently satisfactory traces to show that the Cymri once inhabited the whole Eastern shore of our island. This is not certainly any new theory, as Camden and all our best antiquarian writers have held the same opinion respecting it, but without relying on their authority I give you my views independently of theirs, to which those who wish to know more of the subject may therefore refer.

I have already stated that the names of the rivers in Belgic Gaul bore substantially the same names in the time of Cæsar and other Roman writers as they do now. The Rhenus is now the Rhine; the Scaldis the Scheldt; the Vahalis is the Waal; the Mosa the Maese; the Visurgis is the Weser; the Amisia the Ems; the Isela is the Yssel; the Luppia the Lippe; the Albis is the Elbe and the Granna the Gran. Of these I think the first and last betoken a Cymric origin. The Rhenus from Rhen which in Cymric signifies supreme as the chief river, and the Gran which in Cymric signifies precipitous, shelvy. The other words seem to be names given by the German invaders and explicable from their language, the same as the names of places as far as we can identify present names with the ancient. Thus the Batavi are rspresented in the modern Batawe; the Grudii in the Land Von Groede, the Bructeri in Brockmoreland and above all the Frisii whose name as Freize is yet borne and recognized as their own by so considerable a portion of the people in the country.

If we turn to any map of America or other newly settled country, we may observe how apt the first settlers always are to assign names to rivers and places from some peculiarity they find in their character. The same rule we may be sure always prevailed unless some general appellation was given, or some national epithet applied. Thus the Cam though not the largest, yet one of the most celebrated in our island, has been uniformly spoken of by Poets and Tourists as the crooked Cam. If you will look into the Welsh Dictionaries you will find that Cam there means crooked. The river Trent is distinguishable among our rivers for its force and rapidity. In Cymric or Welsh the word Trent signifies force, rapidity. The river Ouse bears a name common with several others in England, which Camden and others declare to be Celtic. I confess I do not feel so much convinced of that being the case as to make me inclined to rest my argument on what may be pronounced a doubtful derivation, but I have no hesitation in claiming the name of Lynn as Cymric. The Ouse at that place is more a pool

than a river and in former times before thè country was well drained as it is now must have been a lake. Well then, in Welsh you find that Llyn signifies a lake and also specifically a pool in a river.

Here I think it most appropinate to introduce a few observations on the two languages, the Cymric or Welsh, and the Gaelic or Scotch and Irish. These two languages are generally classed together under one designation as Celtic, but as it appears to me incorrectly so associated. They are in reality very dissimilar, as in their construction and inflexions they are very distinct, though their vocabularies have many words in common. In this respect then there seems to be much the same analogy between them as there is between the modern French and English. As with regard to these the verbs and essentials are very distinct, though the names are often very similar, with only a little different pronunciation, so it is with the Cymric and Gaelic, or if any thing more markedly distinct between them.

Under these circumstances we may naturally expect to meet some difficulty in tracing the seats of the different ancient tribes in this island, when we find names and words common to both languages so often as to render it perplexing to decide to which they are in the individual case to be ascribed. Hitherto however we have had no difficulty for the three names already given Cam, Trent, and Llyn, are not Gaelic any more than Saxon, but purely Cymric. The same with such words or names as the Ayre, signifying clearness, Nith, pureness, Clyde a common name for river or brook in Wales, whence the river by Glasgow may be claimed, and one or two others which might not perhaps be allowable to be so classed except in connexion with the others as a probability. Such are the rivers having names with the compound Dwr, water, which word though found in some Gaelic Dictionaries as Gaelic, is not in common acceptation a Gaelic word, though essentially Cymric. Of this compound are the rivers Adour, Calder, Stour (which is well known to be a corruption of Es Dwr) Duran, Derwent, Darent, and I may add the ancient names for other rivers Drinius, Druentia, Duba and perhaps some others.

The next important name to which I have to refer is that formed of the word Avon, the appropriate appellation in Cymric for a river or large body of water, and in Gaelic also, though in that language pronounced Avæ. In the old writers we find many rivers named Abonæ, which must have been taken from the ancient inhabitants, and there are several rivers in England yet bearing that name. But the

most remarkable one I have to mention as bearing it or a compound of it formerly, is the river Humber which by the Geographer Ptolemy is called *Αβοντρος*. Now as it is probable that the ancient Greeks pronounced their *β* as a v, as the modern Greeks do, this name is evidently composed of Avon and tros which in Cymric signifies beyond or exceeding over or above, and hence the great estuary seems to have been described to the ancient Geographer as something more than a river without any particular appellation.

In our times this great estuary is not known by the name given it by Ptolemy but only as the Humber, for which there have been suggested several derivations. One has fancied it came from the Huns, of whose coming into the island however we have no authentic information, and the antiquarian Baxter fancies it from the German Hummen because it makes a loud humming noise. In Cartes' History of England Vol. i. p. 17, an authority which we cannot hesitate in taking, it is expressly stated that this name was originally written and pronounced Chumber, as evidently the Cymric river, as the North-Sea I have before shown was called the Cimbric Sea.

But not only was the river Humber so called from its inhabitants the Cimbri or Cymri, but the whole country North of it was called North Cumriland, though that name has now been discontinued for any other part of the North except the country of Northumberland. It is however preserved in the name of the country of Cumberland, where the Cymri often being driven from other parts of the island seem to have made their last stand, previous to taking their final refuge in Wales. But that they had penetrated much further into the North is clear from the names they have left there, of which it will be sufficient for us to instance the word Aber. This word so common in the East of Scotland in compound names as Aberdeen, Abernethy and others means in Cymric the conflux of a small stream with a larger, and therefore we have it perfectly intelligible as used in Wales. But the word is not Gaelic, in which language the equivalent word is Inver as in Inverness, nor is it known in the West of Scotland, where the Cymri never seem to have entered as occupants. Whence the conclusion seems decided that the Cymri, having first occupied the whole Eastern shore of the island, had been driven first by the Romans and afterwards by the Saxons and even by the Gael eventually from their different refuges to their present habitations in Wales.

Independently however of the names of places, we may

also trace their remains among the people of the East of England in other respects. When a weaker nation is obliged to succumb to any invaders, they of necessity seek refuge in the mountains or other inaccessible places in their country. The fens of Lincolnshire were to the ancient Cymri what the mountains of Wales were as a refuge to their descendants, and accordingly we find there people of an evidently different nationality from others in their neighbourhood. We find persons there in fact more resembling the natives of Wales than they do the people on the coasts, and though among them many traces showing their descent may not now be any clearly ascertainable, yet I believe it would not be difficult to give good proofs of the assertion in their provincialisms, or in their past usages. Thus for instance in the use of the Bagpipe which is so undoubtedly a Celtic instrument that we may claim any people using it as Celtic, though it is unknown now in these districts, yet it must have been common there in Shakespeare's days as he speaks of the drone of a Lincolnshire bagpipe as a proverbial saying.

5. Having thus shown that some people of whom the modern Cymri or Welsh are the representatives formerly inhabited the Western shores of Europe and the Eastern shores of this island, I have it my next point to show from the Cymric records or traditions also that they afford evidences of the same fact. And here I cannot but acknowledge my full acquiescence in whatever merits the modern Cymri attach to those records. They seem to me to bear intrinsic proofs of their truthfulness, for unlike the improbable narratives of fictitious chroniclers, they give exactly such accounts of the early history of the nation as we might be prepared to expect on a philosophical consideration of its character.

These records are given in the form of Triads which of itself seems to betoken their antiquity and genuineness, as if this were the remains of ancient Druidic lore half forgotten, but originally cast in a form intended for learning by memory. This we are told the Druids insisted on as the discipline of their schools; they bespeak a philosophy akin to their institutions. The historical triads which purport to be memorials and records of the events which befel the race of the Cymri from the age of ages give us the following intimations of the primary colonization of the island.

"There were three names given to the Isle of Britain from the beginning. Before it was inhabited it was called Clas Merddin (the sea girt green spot). After it was inhabited

it was called Y Vel Ynys (the honey Isle). And after the people were formed into a commonwealth by Prydain, the Son of Aedd Mawr (the Great) it was denominated Ynys Prydain (the Isle of Prydain or Britain). And no one has any right to it but the tribe of the Cymri, for they first settled in it, and before that time no persons lived there, but it was full of bears, wolves and bisons. Triad I.

The three social tribes of the Isle of Britain.

The first was the tribe of the Cymry that came with Hu Gadarn (the mighty) into the Isle of Britain, because he would not possess a country and lands by fighting and persecution but justly and in peace."

(Here we may observe by way of note that this seems evidently an acknowledgment that the mighty Hu had been driven away from his former country and lands by fighting and persecution.)

"The second was the tribe of the Lloegrians (the dwellers about the Loire or Liger) who came from the land of Gwasgwyn, or Gwas Gwynt (the country of the Veneti about the mouth of the Liger or Loire where the Britons sent assistance to their relations against Cæsar. Compare triad 14 with Cæsar B. G. 3. § 8, 9) and they were descended from the primitive tribe of the Cymry.

The third were the Brython, who came from the land of Llydaw (Letavia or Lexovia the waterside).* And these were also descended from the primitive tribe of the Cymry.

These (say the triads) were called the three peaceful tribes, because they came by mutual consent and permission in peace and tranquillity, and these three tribes had sprung from the primitive race of the Cymry and the three were of one language and one speech."

Such are the traditionary records of the Cymri, which I repeat appear to me entitled to be considered trustworthily historical, as detailed in the various works on the subject. See especially the Cambro-Briton 3 Vols. and the Ecclesiastical Antiquities by the Rev. John Williams. 1844. They show I think further the truth of Cæsar's statement that having been driven away from their former country by the German Belgæ, they were afterwards followed by them into this island and were then subjected to a succession of contests which they had in vain sought to escape by coming hither. Thus driven on by their foes to the West of England, I next attempt to show that they fell in there with

* This name at the present day is confined to Brittany, but it formerly comprehended the entire coast of Gaul.

a people of a different nationality, whose origin we have in like manner to investigate.

That there was a people inhabiting Wales and the Western parts of England previous to the Cymri, is a fact which all Welsh scholars both of present and past times acknowledge, though they have been much perplexed how to account for it. They find proofs on every side of there having been a Gaelic people, and thus they conclude, though against their own traditions which I have transcribed, that these Gael were the first inhabitants of the island and had gone on to Ireland. The greatest of the Welsh Antiquarians the learned Edw. Lhuyd recognized the fact and suggested this supposition to account for it 150 years since. Rowland and other eminent Welsh scholars have in one continued series assented to it, and one of the most recent and most interesting works on Welsh antiquities "Vestiges of the Gael in Gwynedd or Wales," by the Rev. Basil Jones has carried out the subject in a very conclusive manner.

These acknowledgements all arise from their observing in their country names of places and objects which are not Cymric but unmistakeably Gaelic. They might have come to the same conclusion from another consideration, if they had studied Ethnology, namely from the many words in their language which are evidently of foreign and Gaelic origin. This circumstance occurring in any language is a decided proof of some considerable amalgamation having at some anterior period taken place between the two people, and in their case it must have taken place when being themselves driven upon Wales, they found there a small remnant of the Gael who had escaped also from Roman domination.

But not only do the modern Cymri find those names there now, but the scholar also finds them still more remarkably in the writers of the Roman conquest. One word especially has arrested the attention of every writer on the subject, Isca, as applied to a river or body of water throughout the West of England, Isca Silurum, Isca Dumnoniorum and others. This word is not known in Cymric, but it is the common term as uisge for water in the Gaelic of Scotland and Ireland. As we find compounds of Dwr in the East of England where it is not intelligible except through the medium of the Cymric, so in the West we have the word Isca constantly recurring, which is only intelligible trough the medium of the Gaelic. Even in our days the rivers bear only corrupt forms of the old word, whether known as Esk, Usk Axe, Exe, or even Ouse or Isis into which it has been euphonized.

Taking then as an acknowledged fact that there was a Gaelic people living in the West of England previous to the Cymri, the next question arises where did they come from? Here then we must first again have recourse to history. Believing the Welsh Triads to be correct in their assertion that the Cymri first came to the East of the island and found it uninhabited, we may judge it not improbable that the Gael first came to the West of the island from a more Southern direction and also found it uninhabited, at the same time that other bands of them went over to and colonized Ireland. Our argument will admit of the supposition that the Gael first might have settled at least principally in Ireland, whence all tradition shows that Scotland was peopled, and perhaps all the West of England originally.

Cæsar in his tripartite division of Gaul says the people of Aquitaine differed from the other Gauls in language, institutions and laws, further that they were skilful miners, which of course implies the working in metals. Strabo says the Aquitani resembled the Iberi or people of Spain more than they did the other Gauls both in language and appearance (lib. iv. § 1, 2). Tacitus says the Silures or inhabitants of Wales in his time resembled the people of Spain, whence he judged they were of Spanish origin. Vit. Ag. § 11. If we look at the map and suppose any body of people emigrating from Spain voluntarily or compulsorily, we may observe that they would most probably even if it were left to chance strike on the South-western shores of England or the South-eastern shores of Ireland. Thus judging from probability, we might expect that population would have proceeded from that direction, though it is incumbent on us to show from other considerations that we have weightier authorities for our decision than a mere balance of probabilities.

That the Irish Gael came originally from Spain is a fact substantiated by history as well as by tradition, and now may be further proved by those reasonings which Ethnology teaches us to have recourse to in investigating the origin of nations. Not only do the Irish histories and traditions assert this fact, but the Spanish also, and still more the earliest English for Nennius one of the earliest English writers distinctly states it § 13. If then the Irish came from Spain, and if there was formerly a people in the West of England speaking the same language, and bearing every evidence of being of the same origin, then we must conclude with Tacitus that they came from Spain also. Now those people in the West of England are first known to us as bearing a name somewhat equivalent to Silii or Siculi, and from them

the Scilly islands bear their name to this day, as the Silures did in the time of Tacitus. This name was very extensively spread over the South of Europe generally as well as in Spain, and the island of Sicily was also named from them. They appear then to have been a tribe of Gaelic origin, settling finally in England.

Besides the Silures there was another great nation in the West of England known as the Brigantes. This people had also settled in Ireland having been previously settled in the South of France and the North of Spain. The province of Gallicia in Spain which in its very name bespeaks its former Gallic occupation, has to this day the denomination of Brigantina, and the Galliego dialect as it is called in Spain gives decided indications of its original Gaelic character. The physical appearance and manners of the people, the use of the bagpipe and the retention of many words unknown to the Latin, Spanish or any other language than the Gaelic afford the most conclusive proofs of this assertion.

It has been supposed by William von Humboldt and other writers that the singular people now known to us as the Basques were the original inhabitants of Spain, and that they were driven to their present mountain homes on the Pyrenees by the Celts. They suppose also that they are the descendants of the people named by many ancient writers Iberi as if distinct from the Celts. But if those maintaining this opinion had examined carefully the statements of the ancient writers, they would have observed that the various names of Celts, Gauls and Iberi or Celtiberi were applied indiscriminately to the same people. The title Celts or Gauls being given them generally by the Romans, and the name Iberi by the Greek writers who had as it appears to me taken it from the Phœnicians, in whose language, judging from its analogy with the Hebrew, it signified a wandering people.

But whether this theory of William von Humboldt's be correct or not, it is clear from every relic left us by the Greek and Roman writers who wrote after Spain had been subjugated by the Romans, that it was then inhabited by Celtic tribes whether Cymric or Gaelic. I believe that without exception every word handed down to us from antiquity as Spanish, appertain, to either Cymric or Gaelic and not to the Basque, which has no affinity whatever to either of the others, consequently that at the time of the Roman domination at least Spain was essentially Celtic, and judging from the evidences yet remaining in the Spanish language I conclude more particularly Gaelic.

From these considerations my full conclusion is that the

original inhabitants of Spain were Gaelic, and that they sent forth colonies to Ireland and the South and West of England. The Gael of Ireland afterwards went over to the West of Scotland and obtained there a predominancy; but the Gael of England having been either driven away or trampled down by the Romans were at length so reduced that when the Cymri came among them, they amalgamated with them so as completely to lose the little nationality previously left them.

It is in this way only we can account for so many nouns substantive being common to both languages, when in their structure and framework they are entirely dissimilar. An exemplification of this appears in the language of Brittany. This language, the Armoric, though undoubtedly the same as the Cymric or Welsh, still more resembles the Gaelic than the Welsh does, for it has not only its vocabulary much alike, but also many of the inflections. It is in fact an intermediate language between the Cymric and the Gaelic, and this fact speaks its history. It did not gain its relationship from any connexion with the people of Ireland and Scotland, but from their connexion originally with the people of Aquitaine who were the same as the people of Spain, and thus the same amalgamation went on there in a greater degree that had taken place in Wales. The Gael in Wales had been as I said before considerably reduced, but according to this theory they must have been less reduced in Cornwall. Accordingly though the ancient Cornish language has long been extinct as an oral language, yet we have sufficient of its vocabulary left us preserved by Lhuyd and others to show that it was like the Breton a greater compound of the Gaelic than the Welsh.

To recapitulate shortly my views I contend that the people on the South and West of England at the time of the Roman conquest especially the Damnonii, the Silures and the Brigantes, and I would venture to say the South of England generally, were Gaelic from Spain and the South of France. That the other nations were Cymric with a slight edging of Belgæ. That in the course of the Roman domination both nations became reduced and impoverished so as to become finally rendered almost powerless, but especially those in the West. That when the Romans abandoned the island, the Cimbri, weakened as they were, were pushed on by constantly swarming tribes of Belgic or Saxon or German invaders, call them what you will, until they finally took refuge in their present fastnesses in Wales: that they found there a remnant of the ancient Gaelic inhabitants who had es-

caped the tyranny of the Romans, but there so few and powerless that they became amalgamated with and eventually lost in the community of their new invaders.

Of the other nations of England I shall not attempt to individualize any as admitting a decided description. Ethnology and Philosophy itself as I venture to suggest require that we should make as little distinction as possible where there is no real difference. It seems to me therefore idle to dwell on local or sectional names at the time of the Roman conquest, any more than we should now speak of Londoners, Brightoners and Doverites, as if they were a distinct people of different nationalities.

Still notwithstanding these results it appears to me that there must have been left in all parts of England various large portions of the ancient inhabitants whether Gaul or Cymri who became mixed up and amalgamated with the constantly increasing swarms of German invaders, and who with them formed the English language and manners and institutions as we find them. The English language presents in itself the most convincing proofs of this amalgamation, and though Lexicographers have hitherto very unwisely neglected to search into this fountain spring of its original sources, I trust that our future writers will be influenced to do so under Ethnological conclusions and to give this consideration a juster appreciation.

It would be taking up too much time, were I to attempt now to enter on the proofs of my assertions. It will be sufficient for me to reserve to myself the right to do so in case this paper should be considered worthy of publication. In the mean while I think I shall show abundant evidences in the course of my further observations how much the English language owes to the ancient Cymric and Gaelic inhabitants for a considerable portion of the knowledge handed down to us. I proceed therefore to the next principal object of this Paper to show that the ancient Britons at the time of the Roman invasion must have been already considerably advanced in civilization, or at any rate far above being the miserable savages they are generally depicted. This I attempt to prove 1st, from the statements of ancient writers, especially Cæsar; and 2d, from the relics of that civilization handed down in our language as we now possess it.

That the Britons under the Roman dominion retrograded considerably in their previously nascent civilization, may be freely taken for granted. We cannot suppose that the Romans treated them with any more mercy than they showed to every other people subjected to their tyranny. Cæsar who

was by no means the worst of his countrymen narrates his treatment of the Gauls as if it were the usual and proper course to be pursued with regard to the conquered, though to our minds it appears intolerably revolting. Against the Britons he chose to wage war on the ground as he says of their having sent aid to the Gauls in their resistance to him, though they were a kindred people and in so doing only fulfilled a duty which every people in such a case would be bound to attempt. Here then arises directly the question of the state of civilization in which they were found by him as he has himself enabled us to trace it.

Relying on this statement as correct and not a mere pretext, we may first observe that the fact of the Britons having sent assistance to their friends in Gaul is a proof of their having been under a settled government to admit of it, which government must have had considerable resources at their command to prepare vessels in which to despatch those succours. Neither of these circumstances is compatible with a condition of extreme barbarism.

When Cæsar had determinated further on invading Britain it was not as with a contemptible enemy that he prepared for the combat. He set forth with two legions, and we may presume the usual quota of cavalry and auxiliaries attached to each legion in a fleet of about one hundred vessels. The ordinary force of a legion was about 6000 men, so that we may suppose his army to have consisted of at least 13,000 effective troops. When he arrived off the coast of Britain he found the cliffs covered with armed men, acting with a precision and a discipline which afforded another proof of their being under a well organized government. It is his own account of the encounter alone that we have from which to judge of its character, and from that we learn that the Britons not only fought with determined bravery, but also showed a knowledge of a mode of warfare to which the Romans he says were totally unaccustomed (omnino imperiti). This was the use of war chariots and of that use he gives further a very extraordinary account.

After he had made good his landing and advanced a few miles into the country, Cæsar goes on to say that he sent the 7th legion out to forage, when part being employed in cutting down the corn and part in carrying it into the camp, they were suddenly attacked by the Britons and as he acknowledges overpowered and with great difficulty able to sustain the fight. For he adds as the harvest was gathered in every where else and one field only left, the enemy suspecting our men would come thither to forage, had hid them-

selves in the woods, and waiting till our men had quitted their arms and were mowing the corn they suddenly attacked them, killed some and put the rest into disorder surrounding them at the same time with their horses and chariots.

Here then he gives the extraordinary account to which I referred. He says "Their way of fighting with their chariots is this, they drive their chariots on all sides throwing their darts, so that by the very terror of the horses and noise of the wheels they often break the ranks of the enemy. When they have forced their way into the midst of the cavalry, they quit their chariots and fight on foot; meantime the drivers retire a little and place themselves in such a way as to favor the retreat of their countrymen should they happen to beoverpowered. "Thus," he says, "they perform the part both of nimble horsemen and stable infantry, and by daily exercise have attained such skill that even in steep and difficult places they can stop their horses at full speed, turn them which way they will, run along the pole, rest on the yoke and throw themselves again into the chariots with the utmost celerity."

Thrown into confusion by this new mode of fighting (perturbatis nostris novitate pugnæ) it is clear from Cæsar's own account that he had the greatest difficulty in holding his ground, and even in being able to get back to Gaul, where he immediately hastened back without obtaining any successful result. This was all he had to boast of his first invasion, when from his own account he found evidently a well cultivated country, inhabited by an intelligent people who knew how to act in well combined measures as well as with great bravery for their defence.

After having settled his affairs on his return to the Continent both in Gaul and Italy, Cæsar prepared himself for his second invasion of Britain with all the advantages his previous experience suggested. Now however instead of 100 vessels as before he got together a fleet of 800 vessels and instead of 2 legions or 13,000 troops he took 5 legions and 800 cavalry, upwards of 30,000 effective troops. This surely affords a sufficient proof that he had found it was no contemptible enemy he had to encounter. He did not however meet with the same desperate resistance as before the Britons being probably intimidated as Cæsar suggests by the immense fleet that was approaching their shores. Still they seem to have disputed every step of his progress according to his own account, and though he says he took one of their fastnesses and repulsed their various attacks, yet it is clear that the Britons constantly acted on the offensive more than

the defensive, for Cæsar adds "these frequent alarms obliged us to be much on our guard, nor would he allow the cavalry to remove to any distance from the legions, or to pillage and destroy the country, unless where the foot was present to sustain them." Notwithstanding all his vast preparations for this second invasion it is also clear that Cæsar found so little to encourage him to persevere in his attempts to conquer the island that he found it advisable to return with his whole army the same year into Gaul. He does not seem to have advanced one hundred miles into the island, and therefore could have had little means of judging personally of the people so that we must take some of his reports with distrust, though we may rely on the accuracy of his statements from his own observation. Thus when he says that there was an infinite multitude of men in the island and very many buildings (hominum est infinita multitudo creberrimaque ædificia) similar to those of the Gauls, and that they had a great number of cattle, and that the people of Kent in their manners resembled the Gauls, we may fully admit the correctness of his statements, but of what he states of the people in the interior we may doubt the correctness, as they must have proceeded from mere reports without impeaching his truthfulness. Strabo while repeating similar reports says expressly "But we have given even these statements with hesitation as depending on no certain testimony" adding as to their cannibalism that that custom prevailed among the Scythians and under the restraints of a siege many other nations are said to do the same.

Taking then Cæsar's statement that the Britons he saw resembled the Gauls, whose manners and customs we have had detailed to us by other writers, I wish to contend that the Britons were even superior to the Gauls for the reasons I have to give, and that if the Gauls possessed any claim to be considered civilized, the Britons were at least equally so. If the Britons had as Cæsar says abundance of cattle, it is clear they were a farming and producing people. If they had abundance of corn growing as proved by his own accounts, they must have been an agricultural people; and if they had as he says a vast number of *ædificia*, by which we must understand something more than common habitations, then they must have been a people of settled habits and institutions. They must in fact have attained a considerable degree of civilization which though perhaps somewhat different from that of the Romans could not have been justly considered vastly inferior.

It is true Cæsar says also that the people of the interior

did not sow grain, but lived on milk and flesh, and that they clothed themselves in skins. Now as we have before observed this statement must be taken as given merely on report, and it is at any rate equivalent to informing us that the people on the coasts were clothed in garments not inferior to the people of the continent. From other ancient writers it appears that in some respects the Gauls were pronounced a people of luxurious habits even by the Romans, and it can scarcely be supposed therefore that the Britons could be unacquainted with the same refinements.

But in order to set the question at a decisive issue let us revert to what Cæsar has told us of the new mode of fighting he found opposed to him in Britain which with he says his soldiers were altogether unacquainted. He then who for so many years had been waging war not only with the Gauls but with other nations also, now for the first time seems to have encountered a mode of warfare which required great practice and discipline to carry into effect and also great resources and the power of a settled government to initiate. In these respects they must have been even superior to the Gauls therefore in the arts of war and in the arts of peace, to have got together such a force to oppose Cæsar in the first place and to be so well practised in it and to have carried it to such wondrous precision in the second. The suggestions this point raises carry us still further, and deserve our fullest consideration.

Cæsar does not anywhere tell us in express terms of the number of fighting men the Britons could bring into the field, as he does so often with regard to the Gauls. But after the victory he claims to have gained over Cassivelaunus, he says this prince retreated to one of his fastnesses, dismissing all his troops but 4000 Essedarii or those who fought in chariots. Now this is what a late celebrated public character would call a great fact. He does not give us any description of the chariots which he calls Essedæ, but P. Mela who lived about 50 years after him says they were driven some with two and some with four horses. He also says they were armed with scythes, of which Cæsar makes no mention nor does Tacitus. This last writer agrees with Mela in calling them Covini which word I consider taken from the Gaelic Britons and Esseda from the Cymric Britons. Another name given to them was Petorritum which in the Cymric or Welsh language may be understood literally to mean 4 wheeled, and here again there is fresh ground for amazement.

The use of such carriages and the skill attained in the use of them betokens good roads, or at any rate something

more than an unbroken country which P. Mela has supposed to be the dwelling places of savages. If there were not good roads the difficulty must have been greater in using these chariots, and the mechanical skill alone in building them must have been extraordinary. Taking for granted that the account is correct of Cassivelaunus having had 4000 men fighting in chariots, if we allow 4 men to each chariot he must have had 1000 chariots. If we double it and suppose 8 men to each chariot, still he must have had 500 chariots, and here again we have extraordinary results to which these conclusions lead us.

If the Britons had such *ædificia* or superior classes of buildings as Cæsar says, they must have been well supplied with architects and builders. If they had 1000 or even 500 war chariots capable of being used in the adroit manner described, they must have been well supplied with carpenters and wheelwrights. The workmanship of a mere wheel betokens great mechanical skill, what then must we think of the perfect construction which the whole story conveys to the reflecting mind. Not only the chariot and harness necessarily combined with it for the management of the horses, but the providing the horses and practising them to the work. Not only the carpentry but also the iron work that must have been necessary, and also for the manufacture of the arms. The horses must have been defended with armour, or the Roman soldiers could not have been put to rout by unarmed beasts and unarmed savages, when they might by killing the horses have so easily rendered the chariots unavailable. The discipline of the men must have been as perfect also, and we cannot therefore be surprised that even so great a commander as Cæsar should have thought it advisable to return ingloriously so soon, though he professes to have compelled Cassibelaunus to sue for peace and submit to the terms he imposed on him.

Whether the arts betokening a certain attainment of civilization were of native growth among the ancient Britons or acquired from some foreign source, I shall not now stop to enquire. It is clear however that they were not acquired from Gaul, for as we have seen the most remarkable of their practices in war was new to the Romans who had just conquered Gaul. Neither was the high state of learning that existed in Britain among the Druids dirived from Gaul, for Cæsar says the Gaul had their religious institutions from Britain, and further that the sons of the Gaulish nobles used to be sent to Britain for their education. This fact implies that the state of learning was in higher repute in Britain than on the Continent. That learning must have been of a

most comprehensive character. Not only did it combine an initiation into their religious doctrines, their sacred rites and ceremonies, but also a study of the laws which they had to administer and a considerable share of the conduct of public affairs. Beyond these they had an extraordinary knowledge of the exact sciences, Arithmetic and Astronomy, with the useful study of medicine and the refinements of Poetry. They taught also an exalted system of morals, and the Immortality of the Soul, Pythagoras and Socrates could teach no more, and perhaps not even so much. Lucan has described those acquirements with all the fire and graces of poetry to the same effect that other writers have done in prose, and his account has been almost paraphrased in our own language, by the late Dr. Richards in his spirited Oxford Prize Poem entitled 'The aboriginal Britons.'

Hail Heaven born Seers whose magic fingers strung
The Cambrian lyre, who Locrine triumphs sung.
* * *
Ye sung the courses of the wandering moon;
The sun-beam darken'd in the blaze of noon;
The stars unerring in their glittering spheres;
The sure procession of the circling years;
And the dread powers, that rule the world on high,
And hold celestial synods in the sky.
* * *
The warrior souls ye sung would deathless bloom,
When the cold limbs lay mouldering in the tomb;
From the pale stiff'ning corses wing their flight,
And rise in kindred mould to life and light.
* * *
When, amid blazing orbs, the warrior soul,
Borne through the milky way and starry pole,
Would painless tenant through eternal years
Mansions of purest bliss in brighter spheres.

Such were the lessons taught the ancient Britons by their priests the Druids, and hence we cannot be surprised at their contempt of death as we have it described and accounted for. Tacitus and other writers declare them to have been braver than the Gauls, of taller stature and more athletic. Solinus tells us that when a male child was born the mother was accustomed to place his first food on the point of her husband's sword, and placing it in the infant's mouth pray to the gods that he might die in war in the midst of hostile swords and javelins.

Thus encouraged to arms no wonder the youth of Britain were constantly engaged in war. The promise of civilization was blighted amidst intestine dissensions, and when the Romans again invaded Britain about 100 years after Cæsar, they found the people retrograded and falling comparatively easy victims. Yet Tacitus acknowledges that "the wars were for a long time carried on with alternate successes. Just before Agricola took the command in Britain, Tacitus says, a more active campaign had never been known, nor was Britain at any time so fiercely disputed. Our veteran forces were put to the sword; our colonies smoked on the ground and the legions were intercepted on the march. The struggle was then for life; we fought afterwards for fame and victory."

Such were the ancient Britons in war. In peace we can judge little of them except by such minor traits as are scattered through ancient writings. I have already referred to one report which Cæsar has given of 10 or 12 families living in common under circumstances which I cannot but think that great writer as well as commander would have done well to have imitated the caution of Strabo, and treated with distrust. We know, (one of the best evidences of true civilization) that the estimation in which the ancient Britons held their females was of the most chivalrous character. Tacitus mentions it as something worthy of remark that there was no law or rule to prevent females from holding the highest offices and commands among them, and thus we find Cartismandua Queen of the Brigantes, and Boadicea or Bonduca Queen of the Iceni, at the head of their armies and councils with undisputed authority. This has ever since been a peculiarity of British institutions, nor has the country ever had any reason to doubt its wisdom since the reigns of its female sovereigns have been at least as glorious as any in our annals.

But we have reason to believe that the ancient Britons carried this feeling still further. They had females in high authority among the Priests, and the Druidesses are often spoken of in terms importing high veneration. This veneration was extended to the sex generally, if we may understand what Tacitus says of the manners of the Northern nations to the Britons also. I have no hesitation in so doing. Mason and others of our earlier writers have done so, and Dr. Richards in the Poem I have already quoted.

He made no rubied lip nor sparkling eye
The shrine and god of his idolatry,
But proudly bending to a just control

Bow'd in obeisance to the female soul
And deem'd some effluence of the Omniscient mind
In woman's beauteous image lay enchain'd;
With inspiration on her bosom hung,
And flow'd in heavenly wisdom from her tongue.
Fam'd among warrior chiefs the crown she wore,
At freedom's call the gory falchion bore;
Rul'd the triumphant car; and rank'd in fame
Bonduca's with Caractacus's name.

Perhaps the laws of Howell Dha which were compiled from still more ancient laws in the beginning of the 10th century say 920 of our æra and which have been published in 1841 by the commissioners of Public Records, cannot fairly be taken as evidences of what the ancient Britons were under the Romans. It may however be allowed me to observe that they prove a state of society to have then existed among the Cymry at least as refined and elevated, as the cotemporary laws of the Saxons show them to have been at the same period.

A few years since, before Ethnology was acknowledged as a science, it would be considered that when we had gone through what history recorded of any people, we had exhausted the subject. Now however we have another and perhaps still more certain and interesting light to guide us on our way. We do not depend on vague reports and surmises, we travel by a road in which we can scarcely fail to reach what we seek. We study the physical and moral peculiarities of a people, their manners, characters, amusements, institutions and above all their language. The English people boasting as they may of their Saxon, their Norman, their Scandinavian and possibly of their Roman lineages, should be prepared also to consider what they owe to the Celtic portion of their ancestors. The history of a nation may often be best read and often alone known in its language. The English language is much more indebted to the Celtic than is generally understood; and its affinities with the Celtic I will point out in a few words in conclusion of my arguments.

Our Lexicographers have given but little attention to this important consideration, but it is for that very reason it becomes us to supply their deficiency. If then we look through the various terms in our language applicable to the several articles most useful aud necessary in common life, I have no hesitation in saying that a large proportion of them betoken a Celtic origin proving that our Celtic ancestors were acquainted with them and supplied their names.

Taking the common articles of dress, the word Gown, this word is neither German nor French but it is Celtic, and by the Cymri and Gael alike pronounced as the lower orders in England pronounce it Gwn. I need not say that it is uniformly held of the lower orders that they retain the ancient pronunciation more pertinaciously than the higher. The word Glove again is neither German nor French but it is Celtic, and literally means "for the hand." The word Basket is undoubtedly Cymric, for Martial who wrote in the reign of Domitian expressly states it. "Barbara de pictis venit Bascauda Britannis."

Many other words are common to the Celtic and other languages, which words have been ascribed to those other languages, as I contend improperly, for this reason that in them they have no meanings or affinities, no root or connection. I mean such words as hat, coat, boot and others. But in Celtic they have such roots and affinities and tell their meaning. Thus the word hat, which has generally been said to be taken from the German and from the same root as the word hut, as if the hat were a hut for the head. In Celtic hatru is the verb to cover, and het signifies any covering for the head whether a hat or a garland. It would be taking up too much of your time, were I to go through a long array of such words, and I will therefore only refer to a few others and close with general remarks on them.

Such words as iron, copper, wood, leather and others come under the same category. Iron in Cymric is written and pronounced Haiarn, and if you listen to the pronunciation of the lower orders you will observe how closely they retain it. I take however instead of these a more important word and that one representing a vast class. The word tun, ton, town, as forming a component part of the names of our towns is set down as undoubtedly an Anglo-Saxon word, and no one thinks of its being only a representative of the Celtic dun having the same meaning. Plutarch tells us of this in the name Lugdunum, and we have it still left us in a few of our towns and cities, London, Maldon, Abingdon and some others. But it is a remarkable fact that this word meaning a town does not occur in any other dialect of German (see Professor Leo's Local Nomenclature of the Anglo-Saxons, p. 33), and this leads us to another important conclusion.

Our Lexicographers when they have found any modern English word used in that ancient form of it termed the Anglo-Saxon, think they have attained the height of knowledge and that nothing more is ascertainable or to be sought

for. But with all deference to them, I contend that there is another question to be answered — and that is where did the Anglo-Saxons obtain it? If as in the case of the word tun or ton we find that they did not obtain such words from any German source, but that they are found with the same meaning in the Celtic languages, then the presumption seems to me conclusive that they were obtained from those Celtic languages, involving at the same time the knowledge they import of the arts of civilized life, which the Celts communicated to the Saxons.

Whatever superior claims the Romans might have had to be termed a civilized people, the Saxons certainly could not advance any thing like the same claims. They were on the contrary only bands of barbarous rovers, swarming over the sea to seize the lands and possessions of the people they found here. In so doing they adopted many of their customs, and much of their knowledge of the arts of civilized life, they incorporated into their own language many words used by the former inhabitants and perpetuated the names of many of the places they conquered. Let us however do a tardy justice in restoring to their predecessors the credit of what is due to them, and acknowledge that to the ancient Celtic inhabitants of these islands from the impress left upon them of their former institutions, the English people as at present constituted owe so much not only of their population, but also of their language, their character and their civilization.

SUGGESTIONS RESPECTING THE NATIONALITY AND LANGUAGE OF THE ANCIENT ETRUSCANS.

READ

BEFORE THE ETHNOLOGICAL SOCIETY

9. DECEMBER 1857.

Λισσομαι νεῦσον, Κρονιων, αμερον
Οφρα κατ' οικον ὁ φοι-
νιξ ὁ Τυρσανων τ' αλαλατος εχῃ.
I. Pyth. O.

One of the most interesting questions left us from antiquity to investigate, is the enquiry respecting the nationality and language of the ancient Etruscans. On this subject so much has been written and such a vast display of scholarship exhibited, that it may seem somewhat presumptions in one who makes no pretension to a competitorship with it to venture an opinion at all antagonistic to the theories promulgated. Nor should I think of doing so, were it not that those theories divergent as they are from each other, though often supported by arguments very ingenious and erudite, still seem to me generally opposed not only to authority but also to the probable course of events in the history of man.

As my object then is not controversy but simply to assert the preference due to ancient records over modern paradoxes, I shall not particularly enter on the details of those theories for the purpose of confutation, though it may be necessary for my argument to notice them specifically. At the same time I hope it may be allowed me to protest against the practice of so many writers who especially on this subject seem to enter on the question in the spirit of advocates for a particular theory rather than as unbiassed enquirers in search of knowledge. Such writers seem to adopt the practice of first propounding a theory and then squaring every consideration to meet its requirements, without any regard often to the fitness of the argument or its true bearing on

the subject. Such is too often the case with many writers on the Continent of what may be called the German school, and also of many in this country who adopt German scholarship for a model. With a vast amount of learning they show it to be not so much the learning of books as of indexes. They string together as best suits their purpose every reference of every ancient author who has even named the subject matter of their enquiry, without reference to the date or character of their quotations, or even connexion with the point at issue, at the same time adopting a positiveness of true and assertion of correctness amounting to an assumed sense of superiority, before which all doubt or dissent shall be denounced as proof of ignorance or stupidity. Thus in the instance of the question before us, though the whole testimony of history runs in a clear and consistent course from Herodotus downwards with only one solitary exception to the contrary, these writers choose to take that one exception as the only trustworthy guide, and thereupon raise a superstructure of mystery, to make a marvel of a natural order of events, and give an air of profoundness to researches which thereby are only rendered confused and perplexing. Supposing their theory to be well founded they would seem to me naturally to result in the certainty of a spontaneous indigenous civilization, and this is a point on which I venture to enter on a short digression, though it can hardly be considered a digression, inasmuch as it is a part of my argument to contend that all history and experience may be pronounced in accordance with probability respecting it. Under this consideration I maintain that we cannot suppose its coming within the verge of probability for any uncivilized race to emerge from barbarism merely by their own unaided efforts. On the contrary those writers of whom one of the Vice-Presidents of this Society certainly the most profound thinker and writer of our day, the illustrious Archbishop Whately, may be named the chief, appear to me as unhesitatingly to be followed, who contend that man was created with a certain knowledge of and aptitude for civilized life, from which state all subsequent stages of barbarism have in effect been degenerations. That to extricate him from those degenerations some extraneous appliances were rendered necessary, so that civilization is not and cannot be of spontaneous growth, but either a continuation or improvement of some previous like condition, or a communication from some other quarter to any race requiring it, and which had so become degraded from the exalted state in which man had been placed by his Creator on the earth.

In Attica and Etruria before history begins, we have traces and traditions of an earlier civilized race of whose nationality and character we can now only form a judgment from their remains. The Athenians in later times vaunted themselves as autochthones, yet they could give no account of the first working of the mines that were open before them, nor of the early cultivation of their fields, nor even of the stupendous buildings in ruins around them which they called Cyclopean; and while repudiating their Ionian origin, denied the source of their superior civilization. We are so much in the habit of looking on Grecian art and genius as the perfection of human attainments, that we forget to take into account how small a part of Greece was so distinguishable, or the sources whence that knowledge was originally derived. Those who have written volumes on Athens have ascribed her superiority to a variety of causes omitting perhaps the only true one. This was the fact that the people there were more of a mixed race, formed partly of former colonists probably of Phœnician or some cognate origin, workers of mines and masters of commerce, who thus with additional knowledge and energy, enabled after generations to surpass the other Greeks in all the arts of civilized life. In all these we are told the Athenians were the first instructors of the rest of their countrymen. According to Plutarch "the Athenians taught the Greeks to sow breadcorn, to avail themselves of the use of wells and of the benefit of fire." These are according to our notions the first requirements of life, and if the assertion be true it proves the rest of Greece to have been at the time in a state of abject barbarism; and then the question arises how came the Athenians to be so much superior to the rest of their countrymen. In the rocky districts of Attica, the sowing of breadcorn could not be supposed to have been suggested as naturally as in the fertile fields of Bœotia, nor the use of wells to have been first adopted in a land where streams of water abounded. We might from these considerations alone conclude that such primary arts of life must therefore have been introduced into Attica by some foreign colonists, and had thence been extended over the rest of Greece, leaving us to conjecture, in the uncertainty of history or tradition, the origin of those colonists.

In the same manner with respect to the Etruscans, a like explanation gives an easy and natural solution for the extraordinary evidences they have left of a high state of civilization, to which Rome herself owed the best of her institutions. It might be as Niebuhr writes that "the Italian national migrations like those of Greece came down from the

North." But in both cases we can perceive that the centres of civilization as in later times developed were all to be traced to the sea-coasts. The first inhabitants of Italy like the first inhabitants of Greece might have been ignorant and barbarous enough to be unacquainted with the sowing of bread-corn, the use of wells or the benefit of fire. But the earliest accounts we have of that peninsula tell us of a people already settled there, known as Tyrrhenians, to whom later writers have wished to give a mysterious character as if of some peculiar origin, possessing a civilization all their own, and distinct from others. They themselves however never seem to have denied their eastern origin, and in Italy always referred their polity to the maritime city of Tarquinia and their hero Tarchon, both names evidently only varying forms of the national appellation Tyrrheni. All the principal writers of antiquity as I said before, with only one exception, Dionysius Halicarnassus, agree in stating unreservedly that this civilized people were originally a colony of Lydians, increased by other migrations of no doubt kindred character. Herodotus gives the history of their settlement in all its detail, and he is followed implicitly by Cicero, Strabo, V. Paterculus, V. Maximus, Seneca, Pliny and Plutarch, and several others. Several writers who had not occasion to refer to them directly in the course of their narratives corroborate their tradition incidentally. Tacitus mentions the Sardians as producing a decree of the Etruscans acknowledging their descent from Lydia. Virgil who as a poet may be objected to as not writing historically, yet may certainly be adduced as a corroborative authority, not only repeats the legend but further on two other occasions calls the Tiber, the Lydian Tiber, an epithet which would have been absurd if it were not understood as applied to a Lydian colonization of its banks. When these and other writers gave their assent to this tradition, there were still extant many native Etruscan authors whose names alone have come down to us. Those histories must have been well known to the Romans, and they could not have given any other account of their origin than what such laborious enquirers as Cicero, Strabo, Pliny and others I have named have repeated. If they had given a different account such writers as these can not be supposed to have wilfully fabricated another history in contradiction to them, without some of them at least hinting the fact and assigning a reason for so doing. But the unanimity which prevails among so many, and the silence as to any doubt of its truth, is the most convincing proof of the authenticity of the narrative and its trustworthiness.

But besides this direct authority and implied acquiescence in native chronicles, we have other evidences of a common origin not less conclusive. The style of building adopted by the Etruscans was the same as that used by the Pelasgi in different parts of Greece and Asia minor, the works of art the same as those at Corinth and the Grecian islands, especially as those now found at Ægina: the name of Tyrrheni is also found frequently in Greece confounded in the same manner with that of the Pelasgi, with other names in which the significant syllable Tur is prominent. The names of some of their cities as for instance Larissa are similar to others in Greece and the East, and the Etruscan mythology seems to have been unquestionably Eastern. Under these circumstances we might have supposed that there could have been no possible hesitation in at once assenting to the historical truth of the fact of a Lydian migration. But there was one writer of old who thought proper to oppose himself to the general belief, and in favor of his solitary judgment Niebuhr and his disciples have thought right to set aside every other authority, supported by so many corroborative considerations. It will be our duty therefore to examine the validity of the grounds upon which they have adopted this conclusion, though before entering on that examination it may be necessary before hand to refer to the opinions of other writers of note on the subject.

Dempster the first authority on the Etruscan antiquities gives his adhesion to the truth of the tradition. So does Bochart, though he as usual with him, contends perhaps justly for a large intermixture of Phœnician colonization, beyond what we might suppose of the Lydian and Mæonian nations at the period of their migrations being all a cognate people. Winkelman coincides with these, but supposes further a mixture of Egyptian colonization, in who the Count de Caylus enters still more strongly. In this supposition they have found many followers on the Continent in Italy especially, and amongst us Lord Monboddo. But I confess my dissent to this, as the Egyptians were never a seafaring nor colonizing people, and although many of the Etruscan remains bear a remarkable resemblance to the Egyptian, yet we might rather believe these to have come from the Phœnicians who as a neighbouring people no doubt imbibed and possessed many rites and customs in common. Lanzi, another eminent writer on the subject of the last century, though admitting the fact of a Lydian colony, considers the chief element in the Etruscan civilization to have been Grecian, and seeks to prove his theory with great ingenuity from the Eugubine

tables especially, and other relics of antiquity. His work is exceedingly valuable for the collection he has left us of ancient inscriptions, but later writers have refused him the merit his cotemporaries awarded. Still there is no question that many of his speculations are well founded, and some other inscriptions discovered since his time appear to me to support his conjectures, and have the semblance of a Greek, though a barbarous Greek, original. As an instance I would especially refer to the inscription on the vase found at Cervetie given with an attempted explanation in Dr. Donaldson's Varronianus p. 126 and others in the same work. On the other hand, French and German scholars generally have contended for the Northern and Celtic origin of the Etruscans, in which several Italian writers have concurred, while some, as was perhaps to be expected from a natural national vanity, argue for an indigenous civilization peculiar to their own land. At the head of these is Micali, whose labors on this subject are entitled to our due acknowledgement, though we cannot assent to his conclusions. Niebuhr suggests that the language or dialect still spoken at Groeden in the Tyrol may represent the ancient Etruscan, in connexion with his theory that they were descended from the people of Rhætia in that country, founded on the denial of Dionysius that they were a Lydian colony. Humboldt supposed them to be a connecting link between the Iberians and Latins, an offset of the great Celtic family. The learned Müller adopts an intermediate opinion. Admitting an primitive population of Etruria, whose origin however he does not venture to decide, he thinks they were mingled with Pelasgian colonies from Lydia. With this opinion I think we cannot but agree, only carrying it further than he has done. But before entering on this argument I take leave to make another digression as to who were the Pelasgi, though neither can this again be justly considered a digression, as the Tyrrhenians being so frequently styled Pelasgi, the two names become so intimately connected that it is necessary to elucidate both points equally. Though so constantly found named as in different places, the Pelasgi have their origin left us in still greater doubt than even the Etruscans. Roman writers have often associated and confounded them with the Greeks. But the Greeks themselves always made a distinction, though they acknowledged with Herodotus that they formed one of the original elements of the population of Greece, so much so that the Hellenes owed their greatness to their coalition with them (i. c. 58). At the same time their language differed so much from the Greek that they classed it barbarian or fo-

reign (c. 57). But neither Herodotus nor any other ancient writer informs us anything of the original country of the Pelasgians, and all we learn from them is that they were a wandering race, colonizing, commercial and civilized. According to the statement of Dionysius, on whom I have little reliance, they were called Pelasgi from Pelargos a Stork, because they were like that bird, migratory. Why that particular bird was fixed upon for their name, or why they were not at once named therefore Pelargi, he does not tell us. Besides this derivation of the name there have been many others suggested, into the discussion of which I shall not enter, contenting myself with observing that they all appear to me equally fanciful. But I claim an equal right in the field of etymology to suggest one of my own, which appears to me more probable. We have seen that these Pelasgi were not Greeks, as they spoke a different language. At the same time they were scarcely to be styled *βαρβαροι* or foreigners, as they lived too much amongst them and were too much mixed up with them. They were therefore their immediate neighbours, not only in Greece but also in Asia minor whence both people had sprung. Let us then analyze the name *οι Πελασγοι*, as *οι πελας* literally neighbours, and the other syllable formed from *γη* will only carry out the same idea. This seems to me so easy and natural an explanation of every difficulty, that the wonder is it has not been before suggested. The Greeks found them so much intermixed with themselves, and a people even superior in all the arts of life, that they required no other name for them than this familiar one, the original purport of which afterwards became forgotten. Whether they were respectively Lydians, Mæonians, Carians or otherwise the settlers in Greece, they were probably all of one original nationality, with different local distinctions, but all entitled to the same friendly designation. Be this as it may, the ancient Etruscans or Tyrrhenians are constantly spoken of as Pelasgi which at any rate was only another generic name for colonies from Asia minor. This then is the history of the Etruscans for which I contend. Colonists from Asia minor of a highly civilized character found their way at a very early period into Western Italy, which they found inhabited by a Celtic race, whom they reduced to subjection. It seems to me very unphilosophical and even prejudicial to confuse the student of history by a number of names as of distinct people, and so as it were to darken knowledge instead of elucidating it, when the fact is acknowledged that all the first inhabitants of Italy, whatever were their local names, whether Umbrians, Oscans, Au-

sonians, Samnites, Sabines, Sabellians or others, were all cognate people, and therefore all at the almost only spoke different dialects of the same language. Pliny says the Umbri were the earliest and most widely spread race, and that from them the Lydian colonists took 300 towns. These colonists then were not by any means the first inhabitants of Italy, but they probably chose to invade that country, finding it fertile and pleasant for habitation and also an abundance of slave labor to carry out the stupendous works they contemplated. It is the character of these works which gives to this extraordinary people their principal interest. Ancient writers have said little or nothing comparatively respecting them. We know them principally ourselves from their remains, and the modern traveller and scholar looks with astonishment on works which ancient writers have scarcely condescended to mention. We exhume their remains and find in their tombs and on their vases representations of scenes of every day life, which prove them to have been a highly refined people, for though nude figures are constantly introduced, there is nothing given of the gross or licentious. If we turn to the remains of their public works or buildings, we find still greater causes of admiration. We find that they gave their attention not so much to temples, baths, amphitheatres and other works of the like character, as to objects of public utility especially combined with sanitary considerations. Their walls, roads, bridges, sewers and aqueducts, were all upon the grandest scale and of the wisest construction. Their plans for draining and clearing their marshes, for carrying off in gigantic tunnels the water that otherwise would have gathered on their heights and inundated the country, utilizing it at the same time for the irrigation of their fields in summer, show a forethought and energy beyond that exhibited by any other people history has recorded. But they also prove an astonishing command of labor, which must have been slave labor, to enable them to carry such gigantic undertakings into effect, and this coincides with the accounts given us of their conquests over the original inhabitants of the country, whom they thus reduced to slavery and whom perhaps they could only keep in subjection by a systematic employment.

Such were the people whom so many later writers have wished to connect with the wild and uncultivated nations of the North, forgetting in that case to account for the extraordinary circumstance that they should be savages in their own countries, and yet when descending into Italy should have at once assumed a state of civilizations and notions of

polity, such as no people of Italy, not even the Romans themselves, ever approached.

Niebuhr has expressed a conjecture, that the works of art in bronze and others "were not the produce of the ruling people but of their subject bondmen and that the Etruscans properly so called were no more given to the arts than the Romans." With this conjecture I am prepared to coincide, but in a different point of view, the Etruscans of the time of Roman history being according to my argument a cognate people to the Romans, already a different people to the Lydian settlers, who had been then overrun and subduced in their turn by Gaulish tribes, the same as the ancient or first people of Rome had been. The first people of Rome appear to have been of Greek or Pelasgic origin, and though afterwards amalgamated with their conquerors and still forming the mass of the people, yet the whole course of their history shows us that the Greek Pelasgians were the Plebeian, and the Patricians some Celtic conquerors, who amalgamating their energy with the skill of the conquered formed the future governors of the world. When the Celtic nations overran Etruria, they no doubt imbibed in the course of a few generations such a participation in the refinements of the people they had conquered as to enable them to continue it, for how else can we imagine bondmen executing such works, unless their masters directed and appreciated their labors? Mere bondmen could not be supposed to execute them, and an uncivilized people would not have undertaken them. This consideration then brings us back to the statement of Dionysius on which Niebuhr and his disciples have chosen to rely in preference to every other authority, so much so that Niebuhr uses this extraordinary phrase in introducing the subject of "the story concerning the Lydian emigration of the ancient Tyrrhenians, which Herodotus in one of his less fortunate hours understood of the Etruscans." He goes on to say "Dionysius combats the fallacious assumption with great ability. That the account of Herodotus was not founded on even a Lydian tradition he proves by the unexceptionable authority of Xanthus; that it would deserve no credit, even if it had been a tradition, by the complete difference of the two nations in languages, usages and religion." Vol. i. p. 90. These are Niebuhr's words, but as it is my purpose to support the authority of Herodotus and of the other ancient writers who so unanimously followed him, I have equal right to retort on Niebuhr, that Dionysius and even he himself might also have had their less fortunate hours, and the question to whom the preference should be given in this case, whether Herodotus or Dionysius, may

be taken as a criterion. Here then we copy the statement of Dionysius, who we must again remember stands alone against the whole current of authority on the subject. He begins by quoting Hellenicus the Lesbian who says: "the Tyrrheni who were before called Pelasgi, received the name they are now known by after they had settled in Italy," and narrates other circumstances to show that different colonies had settled in Italy sometimes under one name, and sometimes under another, but all referable to an Eastern origin which is the fact in dispute between us. He than on the other hand goes on to refer to Xanthus, Niebuhr's unexceptionable authority. He says, "Xanthus the Lydian who was as much acquainted with ancient history as any one and whose testimony may be as much relied on in that of his own country does not in any part of his history either name Tyrrhenus as a prince of the Lydians or know any thing of the arrival of a colony of Mæonians in Italy, neither does he make the least mention of Tyrrhenia as a Lydian colony, though he takes notice of several things of less importance." Such is his first statement, and before going on the second, I will dispose of this unexceptionable authority of Xanthus by pointing out to your attention that it reduces itself to being no authority at all. An inference alone and that a very unsatisfactory one is to be deduced from the silence of a Lydian historian with regard to a Lydian colony. Xanthus might certainly deserve the eulogium, which Dionysius awards him: but I cannot find that he is mentioned by any other writer who has come down to us, and his silence is surely not to outweigh the positive statements of Herodotus and so many other writers, who must have founded their assertions upon native as well as Eastern records. Herodotus was also a native of Halicarnassus which though not in Lydia was so near it as to enable his authority even if directly contradicted by Xanthus to have been considered equally admissable. But when we find it met merely by a non-mention of the circumstance, it is no contradiction at all, and shows only a fallacy on the part of Dionysius and of those who follow him. So much for this unexceptionable authority. Dionysius then further says, "I do not think the Tyrrhenians were a colony of the Lydians, for they do not use the same language with the latter, neither worship the same gods with the Lydians, nor make use of the same laws and institutions." He also says, "they call themselves from the name of one of their leaders Razena," a fact for which we have no other authority, but which seems to be of little importance, as it might be only local or explicable otherwise.

Lepsius has suggested that the first syllable Tur has dropped out, it appears to me a solution that may be admitted as satisfactory.

Before entering on the examination of these passages I would point your attention to the fact in the first place that Dionysius both by his own statements and by his quotations at any rate confirms the existence of the tradition, though he disputes its correctness. Here then I do not call in question the good faith, but only the judgment evinced. His conclusion is founded upon this consideration, that because the Etruscans of his day were a distinct people in language, laws and religion from the Lydians their then cotemporaries, therefore the ancient Etruscans had not the same with the Lydians of that long anterior period. Between the date of that colonization and the Augustan age in which Dionysius flourished full 800 years at least had elapsed, during which time the most important changes had occurred in both countries. Lydia had been overrun by various hostile forces, and had so changed her inhabitants that Strabo who was nearly cotemporary with Dionysius and is at least fully as trustworthy an authority states "that no trace of the ancient language was then remaining in Lydia." xiii. p. 651. *ταυτης δε ουδ' ιχνος εστιν εν Λυδια.* This Lydian language therefore becomes another mystery to be unravelled, whenever we have sufficient materials from the inscriptions discovered by Sir C. Fellowes and other late explorers to enable us to study them. At the same time with the ancient language the ancient laws and institutions of the Lydians must be supposed to have been eradicated, and others introduced with which the Etruscans could have no analogy. The same change might be supposed to have occurred in Etruria also, and here again we have equal authority for the fact beyond the conjecture. Long before the Augustan age the Etruscans had become a different people from those who had planted the colonies and established the civilization, whose remains so much excite our surprise and admiration. Even in the height of their prosperity they must have had a hostile population living among them in a state of slavery. The last great writer on the subject, the learned Lepsius, has expressed an opinion, that this people the descendants of the original inhabitants, the Umbrians, had in after times recovered sufficient strength to rise in successful rebellion against the Eastern colonists, and amalgamating with them had formed what was afterwards known as the Etruscan nation. But there is neither here any occasion for conjecture, when we have authentic records to inform us. From Polybius to Plu-

tarch, we have abundant testimony to the fact that the Gauls long before conquering Rome, had conquered the Etrurian cities to the North. It is true we know but little of the details, but when we consider how little we know of the Gaulish conquest of Rome, we cannot wonder at our knowing still less of their conquest of Etruria. But the fact remains incontestable, and Polybius, who lived 100 years before Dionysius, says expressly, as if to anticipate modern conjecture, "whatever we read in history concerning the ancient dynasties and fortunes of the Tyrrhenians must be all referred to a former people, for," says he, "the Gauls, who often visited this country and had seen its beauty with a jealous eye, found occasion from some slight pretext to fall suddenly upon the Tyrrhenians with a powerful army, when they were in no expectation of an enemy, and drove them from their native seats" (ii. c. 2). The Lydian or Pelasgic oligarchy had no doubt previously become much weakened, as every oligarchy must be in the course of time without extraneous support and infusion of strength, and thus long even before Roman history begins the Tyrrhenians under the Gaulish domination had become Etruscans. The more peaceful and civilized classes no doubt still remained and infused some of their civilisation and some knowledge of their laws and religious rites to their conquerors. But they must have become a different people however amalgamated. Though we have no mention of the name of the ancient colonists as Etruri or Etrurians, we may accept Niebuhr's suggestion that they probably bore it. If then the dominant Gaulish invaders were of the Oscan family, then we have a clue to the name afterwards given them as Etruri Oscans, Etruscans. This though merely my own conjecture, I think may be received as feasible, in as much as the remains of the so called Oscan language approach nearer to Latin than any of the other ancient dialects of Italy, and if the Oscan Gauls then combining their own language with the Greek of Rome produced the Latin, their brethren in the North had made the Etrurians become Etruscans. This name seems recorded as having been first known used by Cato who died about 150 years before our æra, and he was a contemporary of Polybius, previous to whose time, as we have already shown, the change in Etruscan nationality had taken place. The conclusion is that even the language of the Lydian or Pelasgian colonists had passed away, and though much of their civilisation might have survived, still they had become a different people. A further conclusion also follows that whatever remains called Etruscan are yet spared us, but

especially the inscriptions must be considered and studied with reference to their probable age, whether before or after the Gaulish conquests. It is possible too that different tribes of Gauls had taken possession of different cities of the Tyrrhenians, so that different dialects amounting to different languages might have arisen amongst them. For as the name Gauls was applied indiscriminately to different people, so it is possible that the conquerors might have been of different nationalities, Celts, Teutons, Slavonians, or Scandinavians. Polybius says that even in his time the language spoken by the Romans was so different from that spoken in the time of the first consuls after the expulsion of the kings, that frequently the best learned in it were unable to understand it, p. 311. Cicero says the same thing though it is less remarkable as he wrote 100 years later. The same result must be supposed to have taken place in Etruria, and under this point of view we cannot but pronounce it vain to suppose that in the Augustan age, 150 years afterwards, the languages of Etruria and Lydia could have remained alike though so many changes, though they might have been cognate 800 or 1000 years previously. In that age the language of Etruria might even have become Gallic, and in that case we can understand how Livy, Justin, and even Pliny, connect the Etruscans of their day with the Ræti of the Alps so much so as to pronounce them the same people. In this point of view also the lucubrations of Sir W. Betham in his Etruria Celtica may not be altogether so erroneous as has been charged upon him, though he might not have clearly perceived how the analogies arose for which he contended. They are certainly as well founded as any claimed on behalf of the Scandinavian or any other Northern language, and as successfully advocated. Niebuhr and those who adopt his opinions of the Etruscan nationality do not tell us one word of the peculiar character of the dialect spoken in the Tyrol with which they suppose its affinity. From what we learn from other sources of those dialects they appear to be mere jargons corrupted from the various languages in their neighbourhood. Until they show something more reliable than mere surmises we can however only meet them with scepticism. For a solution of the question in the attempt to decipher the inscriptions it appears to me that the first consideration should be the probable age of the monument in which it is preserved. If it appear to be so late as the historic period of Rome, then it may chance to be explicable by means of the Celtic or some other Northern language provided it be out of the pale of the Greek or

Roman. If however it be found in some apparently more ancient tomb or be of a character representing an anterior antiquity, then it would be preferable to seek its solution elsewhere. For this purpose I should then prefer the attempt being sought in the Basque language. Humboldt as I before observed has already advanced a claim for this people representing the Etruscan Iberians as a connecting link between the Celts and the Romans, and he is certainly correct in pointing out the analogy in the names of many places in Italy showing a close resemblance to the Basque. His theory is that the Basques represent the ancient Iberians, a people who he supposes occupied the country before the Celts. In this opinion I do not agree. I think it clear that the word Iberians was only another name for Celts, the former being principally used by Greek and the latter by Roman writers for the same people. It is my purpose on another occasion to show that the Basques are the representatives of an Eastern colony in Spain, just as the Tyrrheni were in Italy, and then the comparison might arise according to the argument advanced in these pages. If however they are representatives of former occupants, still it will be curious to investigate the analogies which certainly exist offering very remarkable considerations for the scholar and the Ethnologist. 1. That there are many words in modern Italian in common with the Basque which are not Latin. 2. That there are many words in Latin which are not referable to Greek, Celtic, or any northern language, but which have in Basque such strongly marked affinities as to prove that some language of which the Basque is the modern representative formed one of the elements of that very mixed and expressive language which grew up with Roman greatness. 3. That Inscriptions are constantly found throughout Spain, bearing characters exactly similar to the Etruscan, which the Basques claim to explain by their language. I have headed these remarks merely as suggestions, but I reserve to myself the right, if hereafter any part of them be thought worthy of being published, to amplify the details and to point out the particular words to which I have here only referred in general terms.

In the discussion which ensued after the reading of this Paper it was stated that Dr. Freund the well known Author of the Latin Dictionary, who was sent by the Prussian government to the Tyrol to enquire into the correctness of the surmises of some connection between Rhætian Dialects and the ancient Etruscan, had reported that no analogy could be discovered.

ETHNOLOGICAL NOTICES OF THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS,

TAKEN FROM THE SPANISH.

READ

BEFORE THE ETHNOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

In the year 1843 a work was published anonymously at Madrid in 2 vols. entitled "Estado de las Islas Filipinas en 1842" written I understand by Señor Don Sinibaldo de Mas, who had been then lately sent out by the Spanish Government to their possessions in the East, for the purpose of enquiring into and reporting on their condition, statistical and moral. After being out there 16 months engaged in the enquiries assigned him, he returned to present his report respecting them and shortly afterwards published this work which is evidently an enlargement of his report, embracing several further topics which were not perhaps strictly within the compass of his original mission. Among these he now entered into a consideration of the origin of the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands, and of their relationship to the other people in their neighbourhood, supporting his opinions, which appear to me very worthy of our attention, by evidences drawn from their manners, their physical characteristics, and especially their language. Believing that the information he was thus able to communicate with his conclusions thereon would be new and acceptable to the Ethnologists of this country, I have several times during the past year sent to the Continent through different channels for a copy of the work from which to make a full translation for this Society of those parts which relate to our Science. I regret to say that those attempts have been hitherto made in vain, and the work appears to be already what is technically termed out of print. I had, however, shortly after its publication had a copy of the work lent me at Havana, and I was so much struck with the originality, and as they appeared to me the soundness of the opinions advocated in it, that I then made a condensed trans-

lation of the Introductory Chapter with some other extracts into my Note Book for private reference. Had I the work again before me, I might not perhaps think it requisite to enlarge upon the Notes I then made, and though I should certainly have preferred to look over it again before professing to detail to you its information, yet with this reservation I venture to think those Notes will be considered worthy of being introduced into our Journal. It appears to me one of the greatest advantages which this Society presents, that we have here the means afforded us of bringing together into a general centre of knowledge the hints and ideas as well as the actual information given by intelligent writers and observers of other countries as well as of our own, so as to be made easily accessible to all persons interested in similar pursuits. This seems also more especially required when those observations had been originally further diffused through various large volumes, and mixed up with other extraneous matters from which it might be a labor to extract them, besides the difficulty, to some enquirers still more formidable, of being written in a foreign language. It may be true that we may find many travellers, to use Mr. Earl's expression, "innocent of all ethnological theories", but few can be supposed to have been so little observant of facts as not to have recorded what they saw bearing upon Ethnological Science, and in the worst case it then becomes so much the more advisable to extract from them whatever little we may find worthy of being remembered. It may very probably occur also that some travellers may run into errors which may have the effect of retarding instead of advancing knowledge by the conflicting accounts they might render. But this is a mischance which may also befal even those who profess themselves to be masters of the Science, when they allow themselves to be carried away beyond the bounds of actual knowledge, as we find some constantly doing, and substituting imaginative expositions in the place of facts and authorities. The truths of Science like all other truths are clear and simple, they only require to be clearly stated, to be readily understood so as to command immediate assent. On the other hand errors are generally confused, and thus whenever we find a system overlaid with reservations and obscured with a multiplicity of indistinct conclusions which in reality lead to no determinate understanding, we may be sure that the perceptions are altogether faulty, and the guidance they offer not to be accepted.

I trust these preliminary remarks will not be considered misplaced in introducing, as they do, the opinions of an

intelligent foreign traveller, who, though not a professed Ethnologist yet as writing under the influence of his own impressions and personal observation, seems to me to have given the best solution of a difficulty which other writers had acknowledged without being able to explain it. I proceed at once to detail his views, and propose afterwards to show from other writers who have corroborated his statements, how much they have borne out his conclusions. He says,

"The connexion between the languages of all or at least of the greater part of the islands termed Oceania puts it beyond doubt that ethnographers may consider them as of only one people to whom they give the name of Malay. This fact proves that they have had a common origin or had intimate communications with one another. The resemblance in the form of their vessels, houses, and utensils, and in their customs particularly that of saluting with the nose, corroborates this assertion.

In this region there are many varieties of inhabitants who may be comprehended in two great classes, one a people of pale brown hue, nose broad and sunk below the forehead, face broad, hair lank, facial angle acute; and the other which has all the distinctive characteristics of the negro race. This latter is chiefly found in Papuasia or New Guinea, but also in various other islands and on the mountains of many of those inhabited by the former class.

In the Philippine islands both classes are existing. The first known by the name of Indians to whom should be added the Igorrotes or Infidels who are of the same caste in the savage state; the others are the Ahetas or Negritos. The languages of these two classes are not distinct but the same; I mean to say of the same fount or root. One of these two races must be native or aboriginal, the other foreign and conquering.

There are islands occupied exclusively by these Negroes, and there are found further the same people on the heights of other islands surrounded by the caste with lank hair. This caste cannot have been very long time in their present abodes, since the tropical climate has not had time to exercise its influence upon their hair and crisp it. All which seems to prove that the region was originally inhabited by the former class, the Negroes, and that afterwards being invaded in some parts by another people, they receded, taking refuge on the mountains where the usurpers did not follow them.

The identity of the languages which the two races in question speak, the resemblance of color, because even though

the one be clearer than the other, they are both of the same tint, the thick lips, the form of the nose, the acute facial angle, the fashion of saluting with the nose, and various other customs and superstitions common to them, seem also to prove that the invading people did not come together united as a torrent, but by little and little and in fractions, that it was of light color — that instead of teaching the language they brought they learned that which they found — that they were all or the greater part males, and taking the black or native women gave birth to those Mestigos or Mulattoes who in the Philippine islands are called Indians, in the Celebes are called Buguis, and who are known by Geographers by the general name of Malay race, whence also the Malay language.

This lighter colored people that came to mix themselves with the black, must have had the hair very strong and lank, because the Malays have it so.

There are traditions and legends in Java that their forefathers came from Borneo, the inhabitants of Borneo say theirs came from Malaya. The Philippians it is believed are derived from Borneo, and so of the other islands each has its history and refers to another. There are authors who have formed a theory, that they have all received their populations from one centre, and some have even ventured to name it, and say it is Borneo.

Leaving aside the difficulty of conceiving how one single island has produced so many different populations, and how those colonies have managed to cross the seas and gain places very remote, to many of which they could not direct themselves without astronomical knowledge and instruments, since they found islands not distant from America, to which it would be almost impossible to arrive without taking the altitude, there yet remains that of explaining the origin of those same Malays of Borneo. This is, if we may take as the basis of conjecture that the Malays are derived from a people of lighter race mixed with the Papuan Negroes, a fact almost indubitable, leaving it to say what people it was that came to Borneo.

The Padre Martinez Zuniaga has sought to prove that there was a connection between the languages of America and the Malayan, and that considering the geographical situations and the course of the winds it was much more easy for the first inhabitants to come from that continent to Asia than to make the contrary voyage. A modern Voyager who has written upon Oceania denies this assertion, and in an authoritative manner says that it is a great error without explaining how it is so. What is certain is that there are

to be found between the American languages and the Malayan many analogous terminations and words, and some exactly alike, which in the present question is a fact not to be slighted.

In the Philippines at the arrival of the Spaniards the art of writing was known, and Orientalists may see in the Alphabets of that epoch that there is not in them the slightest trace of the Chinese writing, nor the Sanscrit, Tamul, Telengi, Arabic, or in fine of any Caligraphy of Asia or Africa. On passing through Singapore I saw an ancient stone whose inscription no one had been able to decipher, but it was the same kind of writing as the ancient Philippine, though from its bad state of preservation it was impossible for me to read it. This proves nothing further as to the communication which existed between the two countries, since the language affords of this fact an irrefragable testimony, but it is one for believing that they did not obtain the art of writing from Asia. In the Bugin language of the Celebes also there is an alphabet in which no Asiatic analogy is discoverable.

Notwithstanding this and that in the Oceanic dialects there are not found any Chinese roots, yet the broad cranium of the Malay, the acute, facial angle and the lank hair, have made me often think that the Males who mixed themselves with the Papuans must have been of the Mongol race. In Manilla especially, where I observed together at once, the heads of Chinese, of Papuans, and of Philippians, I could not but incline to the belief that the last proceed from a descent crossed of the two former. It would be easy enough in that Capital to make experiments illustrative of the matter, and it would be a subject worthy the attention of its Economic Society. We know that when the Portuguese first came to Borneo that island was full of Chinese and its ports of Champanes. Further in the Philippines are traces of a very remote communication with the same. The savages of the tribe of Benguet use profusely in their dialect the Cha Che, and those who inhabit the heights of Candon (Tinguianes) discover at first sight by their color, physiognomy, and dress, an indubitable Chinese origin.

Neither can we doubt that people came to the Philippines from other Malay islands. The name Barangai to denote a tribe or settlement testifies it, as Barangai or Barangayan signifies a launch or boat, and this is conformable with the traditions that those who came in a Barangai formed a separate tribe and governed by themselves alone. Historic documents also show that there came Bornese who married with Aheta

negresses, and to the Mestigos thence arising they gave the name of Dayhagang.

These immigrations of Bornese, the arrival at the Philippines during our domination of embarcations from the islands of Palaos or Carolinas, driven by the winds, and other facts of the same kind which might be cited, are not however opposed to another theory which I am inclined to sustain as at least reasonable. If we look at a Map it will be seen that the Philippine Archipelago appears united to the points Unsang and Banguey of Calamantan or Borneo by means of two strings of islands; and what yet more calls for our attention is the line that from Cape Nigres in the Bay of Bengala to Papuasia or New Guinea, is formed by the Isles Audaman, Nicobar, Sumatra, Java, Bali, Lombok, Sambana Flores, Timor, and others, which are undoubtedly a chain of mountains running from one end to the other. Might it not have happened that all these islands formed a Continent, and that in some Cataclysm the waters had inundated the plains when the inhabitants had taken refuge in the mountains which remained above the sea and now form so many islands? It appears that the current runs from America to Asia and the former of these may be a modern Continent. The supposition is not of a nature to be termed incredible. There have certainly been revolutions on the earth of greater extent, and if these islands in other times did not form a Continent, how can it be explained that in some are found Brahminical monuments,* when by the books of the Hindoo religion no permission is given to pass the Ganges and go out to sea? How can it be explained that the inhabitants of Oceania communicated with one another, unless we suppose that in very remote times they had a civilization very anterior to ours, whose traces have disappeared, since we scarcely find any other than huge ruins, as for example those of Tinian? The destruction of the Continent might have been effected by means of sinkings caused by a great quantity of matter having been drawn from the inner part of the earth by Volcanic eruptions. Depressions of the earth happening in different places are facts admitted in Geology. Twice during our domination have mountains sunk in the Philippines, of which one opened a way for an arm of the sea.

---

* The monuments are most probably not Brahminical but Buddhist: there is nothing to show that Brahminical Hindus ever extended their faith beyond India, but the Buddhists introduced their religion into Eastern Asia at an early period. It is a mistake into which Señor de Mas might easily fall. *Ed.*

It must be confessed that this is a very obscure question and that it is only by exploring well the country, by joining together many data and comparing them with Geognosy that Ethnography will be able to form a well founded judgement respecting the origin of the people of Oceania."

The above remarks are taken from the Introductory Chapter of the work in the first volume, the remainder of which is taken up with statistical and other notices. In the 2nd Vol. is given a chapter on the dialects spoken in the Philippines, which the author says "are all only corruptions or varieties of one language which forms part of the great family known generally by the name of Malay." He says that it has but one declension of nouns and has neither cases, numbers, nor genders, in which statement all other writers on the Malay languages agree; thus they say, one good man, two good man, &c. The verbs also have no distinctive terminations, as they say, I eat, thou eat, he eat, &c. and they use in conversation only the Infinitive, present, preterite, past, future, and imperative. They seem to have in use some words derived from the Arabic, Persian, and Hindoo, and also from the Chilian, for which Martinez Zuniaga is quoted for an authority, adding that the Padre Fausto Lopez is forming a comparative table of all or most of the dialects of the islands.

Finally in corroboration of his statements and conclusions, the Author gives a Vocabulary of many words in the dialects of the Ilocos, Iagulo, Bisaya, Cagayan and Malay of Singapore, which certainly seem to warrant his opinions. I regret I did not make a copy of more of the Vocabulary than of the Numerals, of which the following is a summary with the addition of the Chinese (Jukien) —

	Iloco.	Jagulo.	Bisaya.	Cagayan.	Malay.	Chinese.
1	Meysa	Isa	Usa	Jadday	Satu	Chiid
2	Dua	Dalaua	Duha	Dua	Dua	No
3	Tallò	Tallò	Tolò	Talù	Tigga	Sa
4	Eppat	Apat	Upat	Appa	Ampat	Si
5	*Limà	Limà	Limà	Lima	Lima	Go
6	Junem	Anim	Uniem	Annam	Anam	La
7	Pitò	Pitò	Pitò	Pitu	Jugin	Chit
8	Oalò	Ualò	Ualò	Ualu	Dlapan	Pe
9	Siam	Siàm	Siàm	Siam	Sambilan	Ka
10	Sangapulo	Sampu	Napulo	Mafulu	Sapùlo	Chaf
20	Duapulo	Daluanpu	Calohaan	Duafulu	Duapulo	Gichap
100	Sangagasut	Isamdaan	Usacaiatos	Magattu	Saratus	Chuppa
1000	Sangaribo	Isanlibo	Usa ca libo	Marifu	Saribu	Ching

* The word *Lima* is peculiarly importance as in many Negro languages it also means the *hand;* thus showing how it became the word

These dialects the Iloco, Jagulo, Bisayan and Cagayan form the principal dialects of the Philippines under the power of the Spaniards at the present day, and are represented as comprising all classes and colors from the deep black of the pure Papuan to the light hues of the mixed or Malay race. Whatever may have been the language originally, it is evident it now extends in its various corruptions very far over the Western Islands of the Pacific; and the wider the knowledge of it we may be able to obtain the more satisfactory will be the opinion we may be able to form respecting it.

Incomplete as it is, the preceding list may yet therefore be accepted as a valuable addition to the Vocabulary published in the 3rd Vol. of the Society's Journal p. 73, with which it will well reward the Ethnologist to compare the several words carefully as it will enable him to trace, I think, very distinctly the course of migration, not only through the islands usually recognized as inhabited by Papuans or Malays, but also many beyond the range generally assigned them. In the excellent work published by Mr. Earl as Vol. I. of the Ethnographical Library there are a few Specimens also given of Papuan and North Australian dialects, which we may regret to find so little extended, as the Author was evidently a writer on whose judgement we might place full reliance. Referring to his table for other dialects, I should wish to insert here the cardinal numbers he gives of the Onin or Woni dialects of New Guinea to be compared with the Philippian 1 Sa, 2 Noewa, 3 Jeni, 4 Faat, 5 Nima, 6 Nem, 7 Tarassa, 8 Taranoewa, 9 Sapoeti, 10 Poesoea. With these, and also with the other dialects, the Arru, more especially considerable resemblances will be found to exist, and it is interesting to observe that the greatest is found with the Onin, of which people Mr. Earl says they "have been considered from time immemorial as the most numerous and best organized of the New Guinea tribes, and whose country has never yet been visited either by Europeans or native traders," p. 59. They are pure Papuans, and the connection therefore to be observed between their language and that of the other people of black or brown or lighter hue in the neighbouring islands will be of material advantage in considering the question of their relationship. Mr. Earl refers to Captain Forrest's account of his Voyage to New

for 5. Mr. Crawford at p. 236 of his Dissertation gives the numerals somewhat differently but in some instances makes the resemblance greater than Señor de Mas.

Guinea in 1770 — but makes no use of the copious Vocabulary attached to that narrative, of Magindano words and a few Papuan. The former Magindano being the language of the island nearest to the Philippines might be expected to prove as it is almost identical with the dialects given by De Mas as above cited, but his statement of the Papuan seems more different. As Forrest's work is now somewhat scarce, I think perhaps it would be advisable in this place to copy the list of the numerals he has given to be compared with the others already referred to. *Magindano.* 1 Isa, 2 Daua, 3 Tulu, 4 Apat, 5 Lima, 6 Anom, 7 Petoo, 8 Walu, 9 Seaow, 10 Sanpoolu, 100 Sangalos, 1000 Sanlibu. *Papuan.* 1 Oser, 2 Serou, 3 Kior, 4 Tiak, 5 Rim, 6 Onim, 7 Tik, 8 War, 9 Siore, 10 Samfoor, 100 Samfoor Ootin, 1000 Samfoor Ootin Samfoor. Forrest however does not say from what part he took these latter words, though there can be no doubt of his having given them correctly as he heard them, and they bear sufficient resemblance to the other lists to prove their relationship.

Such are the views and statements of the Spanish author, whom I have sought to introduce to your notice. It will be seen at once that he writes merely as a traveller, giving an account of what had come under his personal observation, and not as a philosophic maintainer of a particular theory. We may therefore pass by without any lengthened remark his suggestion about the islands having been at some former time a large Continent which in some convulsion of nature had been sunk leaving the mountains as islands in the sea. Such convulsions have been of too frequent occurrence in the history of the world to allow us to dispute the possibility of one having had such effect in the regions referred to. There does not however appear to be any tradition of such events among the people inhabiting the Archipelago, and when their origin can be sufficiently well accounted for by accidental migrations alone, it is quite unnecessary to imagine a catastrophe, which if it had occurred after the country had become peopled, could scarcely have passed out of memory, even if it could be supposed to have left any people there surviving it. But the auther himself has given the best indications of the mode in which the islands had become inhabited, when he refers to the fact, as of frequent occurrence, of vessels driven by the winds out of their course to different islands. Beyond his acknowledgement we find numerous instances of the some kind in the narratives of different voyagers, Mr. Crawfurd in a valuable paper printed in our Journal Vol. I. p. 369 quotes from Captain Beechey the in-

teresting account of his having "picked up at sea a tempest driven canoe in about the 20th degree of South latitude, which has been driven 600 miles out of her course and which when rescued was found to have on board 28 men 15 women and 10 children, in fact the nucleus of a little colony." Such cases may be presumed to have been of frequent occurrence and may account for the various islands having become populated without the aid of nautical instruments. De Mas himself further shows how that some such little colony having come in a Barangai or Launch, had probably been the origin of that word having been also given to a tribe, and thus that the same course of events had been in long operation. We can therefore well be prepared for the fact he tells us of the same language intrinsically, being found in many different islands with other evidences of advanced civilization such as the knowledge of letters. On this point it is interesting for us to learn that the well known ancient Inscription found at Singapore could be identified with the Philippine characters. Mr. Crawfurd in the valuable paper he read before this Society on the various Alphabets of the Indian Archipelago, Vol. II. p. 253, also refers to this Stone at Singapore as bearing a very rude but long inscription in what he calls an unknown character, but which he supposed to be the ancient Malay of Sumatra. Now however it is thus shown to be of the Philippian, and according to the statement of our author may to be explained accordingly in the modern Malay of the country. This fact is of itself alone very important as connecting Singapore with the Philippines, but it becomes still more so from another circumstance mentioned by Mr. Crawfurd p. 79 of his Dissertation, that there is another stone inscription in Borneo of the same characters as that at Singapore, which again he terms unknown, but which may thus also be translated by the Philippine. As far as our knowledge of its history extends, the Malays have always been in possession of Singapore, even before their conversion to Mohamedanism, and they are said to have come there from Sumatra. But whether this tradition be true or not, as it will not be inconsistent with our argument and may even support it, we may take it for granted as connecting them with the great extension of language and family conprehended under the name of Malayan.

From these statements of our author we find 1. That the original inhabitants of the Philippines found there by the Spaniards, comprising the brown population and the black or negrito, all speak what is in effect one language, divided

into 4 dialects, and what is more remarkable that it is in fact the same as the Malayan of Singapore. This Malayan language we learn further from other sources, extends in its various dialects not only over the Indian Archipelago to which the Continental writers have given the name of Oceania, but also into the Pacific and to the main-land of Asia, and in some degree to the island of Madagascar. Mr. Marsden and some other authorities have thought it confined to the brown coloured people commonly known as Malays, but later information collected or given us by Mr. Earl, Mr. Crawfurd and Dr. Latham, shows us that the same language is also possessed in a greater or less degree by a number of the black coloured tribes, while some of the brown tribes have equal degrees of difference among themselves. What may be the real degree of relationship of these several languages or dialects to one another is of little consequence to the course of argument I have to maintain. Mr. Crawfurd, whose long residence in those countries and means consequently of knowledge entitles him to our first consideration, begins his Paper printed in the 1st Vol. of our Journal in the year 1848 and also his valuable Grammar published in 1852 with these words, "Distinct and unequivocal traces of a Malayan language have been found from Madagascar to Easter Island and from Formosa to New Zealand over 70 degrees of latitude and 200 of longitude." Having made this broad admission he proceeds to state, that, "to account for this remarkable dissemination of a language singular for its extent among a people so rude, it has been imagined by Mr. Marsden, Sir Stamford Raffles, William Humboldt, and others, that all the tribes within its bounds with the exception of the Papuans and Negroes, constitute one and the same race and had originally one language broken down by time and dispersion into many dialects." Somewhat inconsistantly then with his first announcement he disputes this theory and carried away by physical characteristics he adds, "whether their languages be of one stock or not, the men themselves belong physically to distinct races, to be divided into three groups, men of brown complexion with lank hair, men of sooty complexion with woolly hair and men of brown complexion with frizzled hair, each again consisting of several subdivisions." Having adopted this opinion evidently on view of personal differences, he endeavours to counteract the admission he had first made by attempting to show how little of the Malay language was to be found among the several other tribes he refers to. In so doing he has shown however, in my humble judgement, notwithstanding his learned

and ingenious effort to the contrary, that, if they had not one common origin, yet still there must have been a considerable intercourse and admixture among them to produce such a result. Mr. Earl's work shows the same conclusion, and Dr. Latham has followed them in these opinions refining however upon their subdivisions and inventing names for them, which have only the effect of complicating a question which rather required simplification. Even if Ethnography as a science be in any way distinct from Ethnology, still it is further removed from Geography and should refer to characteristics of people in their approaches to one another, their diversities, rather than to their mere locations. Dr. Latham in his new work Varieties of the Human Species, observes of the inhabitants of the Oceanic group, that their diffusion is one of the most extraordinary phenomena in Ethnology" p. 341, and giving them some extraordinary new names as Protonesians, Amphinesians, Kelaenonesians and others, admits the fact that many of the tribes, of different hues, and some absolutely black speak the same language. The people of Semang and Jokong, to whom he especially refers, are however inhabitants of the interior of the Peninsula of Malacca, which Peninsula like most of the islands of the Archipelago is inhabited by the Negro or Papuan race in the interior and by the brown coloured people or Malays on the sea coasts. All writers concur in concluding from this that the blacks were the original inhabitants and the others were intruders. But then arises the difficulty to be explained why do all these people in many cases as in the Philippine islands speak the same language, and in others a language with so strong an admixture of the Malay? We may pass by any notices of their manners or habits which among rude people in the same climate may always be expected to be somewhat similar. But as we are told by every writer that all these various coloured tribes are at constant enmity with one another, so that it is impossible to suppose that they learned those languages by any friendly communication, it appears to me an inevitable conclusion from these premises that the opinion given by the Spanish writer is correct, and that the brown coloured people are in reality only the descendants of some lighter colored people who had intruded into the countries of the blacks, and thereupon taking the women for themselves had left a progeny now known in the East as Malays. If this theory be correct, it follows that the Malays are not a pure and distinct race of men as has been commonly supposed, but a mixed and mulatto race between the red and the black. I take the word race in accordance

with the general use of it, but only in a larger sense to denote the several families of mankind designated thus according to their color, objecting to the word if it is at all to be understood in the sense given it by some modern writers, as implying several distinct original creations of what they term "primitive men." In the first ages of mankind when their numbers were yet scanty, but their evil propensities for violence as virulent as they have ever since been, we may easily imagine that many families might wander from fear of their fellows or from other causes very far from all social communion with their kind, which families in the course of ages might grow up into nations of very strongly marked peculiar characteristics as regards manners institutions and language. The latter as the great connecting link by which we may trace the migrations of men in accordance with the precepts of our illustrious former President Dr. Prichard is certainly an essential object of our inquiry but one that may be modified by circumstances. When a large family of men has grown up into a large nation, so that their language has become widely diffused and handed down from one generation to another it may become almost an impossibility to alter it. But in the case of a small family or nation that may be absorbed in a larger, such a result we know has been of frequent occurrence in history. Again the same result may arise from natural causes. Moffat in his "Missionary Labors and Scenes in Southern Africa" observes of the wandering tribes there met with, that they are often compelled to traverse the wilds to a great distance from their villages. On such occasions fathers and mothers and all who can bear a burden often set out for weeks at a time, leaving the children to the care of two or more infirm people. The infant progeny romping and playing together, the children of nature through the livelong day, become habituated to a language of their own. The more voluble condescend to the less precocious, and thus from this infant Babel proceeds a dialect composed of a host of mongrel words and phrases joined together without rule, and in the course of a generation the entire character of the language is changed." This statement of a fact is so true to nature that we at once admit the probability of its occurrence, and thus may account for many dialects if not different languanges existing among uncivilized tribes living separate by themselves, though no doubt of the same kindred origin. The more uncivilized we find a country the more decidedly distinct we find its dialects, and languages which thus grow up as it were from chance or caprice like weeds in a rank

soil without order or rule. To investigate such languages may be an object of great curiosity where full means are possessed, but it may be doubted, whether the utmost study of them could lead to any profitable results, while the attempt to classify them into groups, as we find various writers doing on the strength of some few words picked up among them, cannot but be the occasion of numerous errors. Under these considerations, though the more closely approaching to one another we find these dialects or languages, the more confidently we may pronounce on the affinity of the people, still any disagreement whatever must not be taken absolutely as a difference of origin. If however we have reason to dispute the use of the word race as leading some persons to consider mankind of different origins, still more reason have we to dispute the propriety of the term Varieties of the Human Species as leading to the same deductions. Classifications of this kind based not upon their language, their institutions, or manners, but solely on their color, or gradations of color, appear to me highly incorrect and unphilosophical. Every day's observation shows us that children of the same parents are constantly born of very distinctly marked complexions, and all history tells us the same fact. The earliest record of our race tells us that of two brothers, who were also twin brothers, one was a hairy man and the other a smooth man, one was born red and the other as the prototype of his race was probably a dark man. Such children born light or fair, if placed under peculiar influences of climate, would feel the influences of climate and leave family characteristics to their children more or less strongly marked according to circumstances. Officers who have served on the coast of Africa, I know, and I believe Europeans generally, there not only become what is commonly termed tanned, but find their hair become also crisped, so as to give them the impression of its becoming of an altered nature which in the course of years or generations might even render it woolly. Experience thus shows that the color of the skin and even the character of the countenance, becomes modified by climate. In the course of upwards of 13 years residence at the Hanava, where I had many hundreds of Africans under my superintendence, I soon became able easily to recognize youths who had been born in Africa from those of the same class who had been born in Cuba. If they had been brought very young from Africa, as they very frequently were, they grew up equally intelligent and cleanly, the one as the other, but still distinctly different from each other in the character of the

countenance. Their color at first would assume a brighter glossier black than the color of the adult African, and in some cases enabled me to understand the raptures of a Dignitary of our Church over some of the Negroes of Ethiopia, when he wrote of the Sheygija, "they are a clear glossy jet-black which appeared to my then unprejudiced eyes to be the finest color that could be selected for a human being." Waddington's Visit to Ethiopia p. 122. What that color might eventually become in the island of Cuba which is on the border of the tropics, in the lapse of any considerable number of years, I could not judge of, as from the policy of the slave dealers and slave owners few females comparatively were brought over, as they found it easier to buy the adult slave ready for work than to rear up their progeny. But in the colored population of the Bahama Islands and of the Southern States of the American Union, I observed their color was already manifestly becoming lighter or brown or olive, I may say so universally that I could only ascribe it to the climate and not to any admixtures. The hair certainly still remained woolly, but the climate was perhaps yet too similar to the African in temperature to have any effect upon it for a much longer period of time than had elapsed since their progenitors were brought there. But this was not all. Not only was the color lightened, but their features were also altered, and I thought I could distinctly trace in the colored population the same cast of countenance which we find marks the white natives of that continent in a very early stage of their generations. This cast of countenance some of our Ethnographers may perhaps sometime hence describe as the Yankee type, or by some fine name from the Greek ending in esian, among the Varieties of the Human Species, for which if any illustration is required I have only to refer you to the Portraits of the Presidents and other leading Statesmen of the Union and to the general average number of American citizens, whom we cannot fail to recognize almost at a glance in our streets. We observe in them an elongated countenance of a whitey brown color, strong coarse hair, a rigidity of features, lank figures, with a length of arms and legs disproportionate to their frame. The females lose the color of their European parents, and attain a statuesque style of beauty, in like manner very different from the softness and fulness of the English, these changes resulting in the same type whether their parents were of British or Continental origin. When we see such changes going on unmistakenly under our present observation, in our own generation and among our own kindred,

how can we say that the differences among the brown colored and other dark people which are no greater in degree constitute them to be Varieties of the Human Species? Were there any difference in the number, the arrangement or shape of the limbs or features or character of the senses we possess in common, then there might be some ground for such a term, but it is clear that color is in a great measure if not altogether dependent upon climate, which has a great effect also upon other parts of the frame. Even as regards the shape of the skull, upon which some Physiologists have laid such stress as indicating differences of races, Dr. Prichard on the other side in his last Anniversary Address to this Society Vol. I of our Journal p. 307. points out the fact that "they would thus establish distinctions in the form of the skull among nations who though for many ages separate are known historically to have descended from the same original stock." To which consideration in denial of the doctrine we may further add the evident difficulty of being able to take the average size or shape of skull of any people from a few isolated crania that may come into the possession of the most pains-taking philosopher, to say nothing of the possibility of his being deceived by erroneous information. Again it has been said that the Papuan negroes are a distinct class of Negroes from the African on account of the different nature or disposition of the woolly hair they bear naturally or artificially. But this is an erroneous supposition also. The Negroes of Dongola wear their hair exactly as the mopheaded Papuans, as may be seen by the frontispiece to Waddington's Travels, and it is often to be noticed among Africans that they have their hair in tufts or twined spinally or in rows as we find the Papuans described. These people of all shades all the writers to whom I refer tell us live "in the fastnesses of the mountains in enmity with the civilized races of the plains" and the "most deadly feuds and animosities between the various tribes" exist also. Under these circumstances it is difficult to imagine how any intercourse can take place between them of a nature to have any effect on their languages. Mr. Crawfurd who from his long residence in the East among the Malays and from his evidently industrious study of their languages is entitled to our grateful thanks, and first consideration distinctly assents the existence of Malay words in all the negro languages, p. 2 of his Dissertation and again p. 170. He differs from Dr. Latham as to the Samang and says it is a different language from the Malay p. 166, but acknowledges himself to be totally unacquainted with the languages

of the Negroes of the Philippines. Ibid. It is for this reason especially that the information given us by Don Sinibaldo de Mas is particularly important. The great object of Mr. Crawfurd's Dissertation is to prove that the old theory of Marsden, Reffles and Wm. Humboldt which has also been adopted by Mr. Earl is erroneous of there having been at some former period one general language prevailing through the Archipelago, of which the various languages now existing are dialects or fragmentary relics remoulded into their present forms. His learning and knowledge of his subject is entitled to our greatest respect, but his conclusions do not appear to me always equally well founded, especially his illustrations. He frequently refers to what he calls Latin words in the Welsh and Gaelic and observes "the proportion of Teutonic words in Italian or French, or of Norman French in English, far exceeds that of the Malay in these languages, but we do not therefore jump to the conclusion that the German and Italian races and language are one and the same or that the English people and their language are of Gallic origin" p. 159. Granted that the existence of a great number of words of the same sound and import in different languages do not afford a good conclusion for their being derived from the same stock, yet it does prove that there must have been at some anterior period a great intercourse, connexion or commingling between the several nations whereby the languages became so mixed up together. As to the Malays it appears clear that they are divided into a number of different nations, speaking very distinct languages, p. 144, and possessing different characteristics and shades of color. The latter I mention more particularly, as it is upon that distinction that they are made to constitute Varieties of the Human Species. Some of these Malays are described fairer than others, some browner, and Mr. Crawfurd refers to some as "intermediate between Malay and Papuan", p. 94. He attempts to disprove the connexion of languages, but passing by the remark that we might show from his own statements a greater connexion than he is willing to admit, yet still he admits enough to prove a very intimate connexion between them. The question then arises how to account for that connexion except by intimate relationship of some sort or other between them, such as Don Sinibaldo de Mas has pointed out? They were at constant enmity, they had little or no commercial intercourse, they had no missionaries to send out, and yet as in the Philippine islands, as Mr. Crawfurd admits, besides the numerals they had the same primitive words as we may term them

such as for head, brain, hand, finger, elbow, hair, feather, child, sea, moon, rain, and verbs such as to speak, to die, to give, to love, and others, p. 5. Speaking of some pronouns he says, "my notion is these pronouns have been borrowed by the Malays and Javanese from the languages of the Philippines and added to their own long lists of pronouns of the first and second persons," p. 113, see also p. 127. De Mas states unhesitatingly that they all speak the same language, the black and brown tribes, and the acknowledged Malays, conquered nations even do not always readily or immediately adopt the languages of their conquerors, but these black tribes never were conquered, never even were tributary or under the dictation of the Malays, while the latter in all their characteristics exhibit only those of a mixed race and an intrusive people. Dr. Hodgkin in his first very able address to this Society mentioned "a striking example under his own observation furnished by a mixed race resulting from the alliance of the woolly headed African Negro with the stiff and straight haired Indians of Southern America, which he said presented a remarkable resemblance to some of the Australian natives." Journal Vol. I. p. 144, and then pointed out those indications that certain combinations of which the elements are known produced physical characters resembling those of groups of which the origin is obscure." Such are the indications also of the Malay race, and judging of the subject only as I find it dealt with by those who from personal knowledge of the countries are best competent to form a correct judgement respecting it, the conclusions of Señor De Mas appear to me well founded. I confess my predilections go strongly with this theory. Not only do I venture to think it a service to Ethnology to strike out of our nomenclature the divisions and subdivisions that encumber it, and so to simplify its character, but also to solve another problem which the opponents of the Unity of the Human Species have strenuously put forward as a fact in support of their views. If the Malays are a mixed race, they are also a widely spread race, there are no indications of infecundity in their history and their progenitors therefore were not of such different natures as to render propagation a physical impossibility among their progeny. This seems as extreme a case as can be pointed out, but the advocates of this doctrine not contented with confirming it to extremes, have extended it even to nations of nearer colored complexion and physical characteristics. They represent all the contentions of the world as contentions of races which never amalgamate. But if any one thing in

history is clearer than another it is that different families of nations do amalgamate, and that it is according to the innate worth of the different elements what good or evil results. Rome for instance in ancient times presented the greatest amalgamation of nationalities, as England does in the present day, and if Rome fell at last it was under the pressure of a barbarous horde, and not from any ill consorted union of different races within her own empire. In the same manner England is strong in the combination of her different nationalities, and need fear no outbreak of internecine animosities among them so long as her institutions are based upon an enlightened policy and a Christian civilization.

ON THE PROBABLE ORIGIN OF THE AMERICAN INDIANS,

WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO THAT OF THE CARIBS.

READ

BEFORE THE ETHNOLOGICAL SOCIETY

THE 15th MARCH 1854.

Baron von Humboldt, in his first work on New Spain (Book II. ch. 6.), has expressed an opinion, which I believe he has never since either retracted or modified, that "the general question of the first origin of the inhabitants of a continent is beyond the limits prescribed to history, and is not perhaps even a philosophical question." To this latter declaration, made by one so justly eminent in literature, I think it becomes our duty to demur, as members of a Society devoted to the study of that new and important science of Ethnology, which takes for its ground of philosophical investigation the origin and relationship of the inhabitants of every portion of the globe. In the pursuit of the inquiries we have in this study to institute, we certainly have often to proceed beyond the limits of history, and often to act independently of it, without, however, at any time conceding our claim to have those questions recognised as philosophical questions: for as we are told in law that circumstantial evidence is sometimes more trustworthy than positive testimony, so our inquiries may sometimes lead to results more satisfactory and convincing than the direct statements of authors, founded, as they often are, on uncertain traditions, or mistaken information. The only history on which we can confidently rely for the correctness of its statements, where a distinct record is given, is that one contained in the Holy Scriptures; and as the fullest investigations have only served to authenticate and verify their statements, the more we take them for our rule and guidance, the more certain we may feel of our travelling in the right paths.

I venture to make these observations here primarily; 1st: as leading me directly to the arguments which I have to adduce in support of my theories; and 2dly, because the learned Baron, in another part of the same work,* and again in his last publication, "Cosmos," seems to countenance the ideas of some others, who have held that there were originally various distinct creations of beings of the human race, contrary to our faith that "God hath made of one blood all the nations upon earth." In the same chapter he says "Perhaps this race of copper-coloured men, comprehended under the general name of American Indians, is a mixture of Asiatic tribes, and the aborigines of this vast continent;" as if the two races were essentially distinct from each other, and as if the copper-coloured men, comprehended under the general name of American Indians, with all their mixtures, could not all of them have been only different migrations of Asiatic tribes, earlier or later arrived on the new continent.

In his last work, "Cosmos," Baron Von Humboldt expressly acknowledges the unity of the human species, but he seems at the same time to qualify this admission, by quoting approvingly a passage in the works of John Müller thus, "whether the existing races of men are descended from one or from several primitive men is a question not determined by experience."

Supposing that the translations from which these quotations are taken have been correctly rendered, it is not clear what these writers require for experience on such matters, or for philosophy itself; but whatever may be their views on these points, I proceed at once to the position I assume, that all the experience we possess, and all the conclusions we can in reasoning deduce from it, only tend to prove the correctness of the account given us in the Mosaic history, taken merely as history.

From this history we learn that the world, after the flood, was peopled from one stock, diverging into three families, evidently typifying the three varieties into which we see mankind divided, of which families some one or more of the branches might naturally be expected to carry out their distinguishing characteristics more decidedly than the others, according to circumstances, and yet, at the same time, only form connecting links in a graduated chain which united them in one universal relationship. As the different branches of each family diverged proportionately from each other, they might thus be expected to extend further their peculiar

* See Prichard's Origin of the Celtic Nations, page 2.

characteristics, until at length the extremes of each would become necessarily the apparent opposition of the others. As in every day's experience in private families we see children of the same parents of very different complexions, so each of them might transmit the different shades to their descendants, until, in the great family of nations, we might expect to find one very fair, another extremely dark, and a third brown or copper-coloured, consistently with the fact of their common origin. In the three continents of Europe, Africa, and Asia, we find three great families of mankind so distinguishable, as white, black, and copper-coloured, with a variety of intermediate gradations, sometimes dependent upon local circumstances, sometimes consequent upon intermarriages, and yet, according to our hypothesis, all arising from natural causes. There are other writers however, who, taking up these differences as radically existing, contend that there are primarily five, or seven, or various greater numbers of races of man, which numbers indeed, if we allowed any real foundation for their suppositions, might be extended to the utmost limit. For thus they might, upon their assumptions, be entitled to divide, not only the dark, but also the white-complexioned people into different races, distinguished by the colour of their hair and eyes, and shades of complexion, which are variations as decided as those they point out among the darker-coloured branches of the human family, though we have become so familiar with those differences amongst ourselves, as to consider them of only minor importance, or of a cognate character.

When, however, we thus find writers of the greatest talents, who have made the human frame their peculiar study, not agreeing amongst themselves as to the conclusions to be drawn respecting the physical history of our species, it may be fairly allowed to those who have not entered professionally into that study to assume, that if there is no certainty attainable in it from their speculations, then the origin of nations becomes a question more peculiarly for philologists to discuss. It is as a philologist therefore alone that I profess to enter upon it, following the course adopted by one of the most eminent in those inquires, our late respected President, Dr. Prichard, in the belief that it is to the study of languages, after all, that we are to look for the most satisfactory elucidation of the question. It is by this means we may best hope to ascertain the affinities of nations, and, tracing the several families of mankind back to their sources, where the branches diverged from their parent stem, may obtain a full confirmation of the belief of their original unity.

In taking for consideration the subject of the probable origin of the American Indians, I trust that these preliminary observations may not be judged inapposite, when so many writers — as Professor Agassiz, Dr. Morton and others — directly, and so many — as Malte Brun, Humboldt, and others — indirectly, have advocated the doctrine of distinct races having been created, like the lower animals, suited peculiarly to particular climates and localities, and have, upon this assumption, assigned for those whom they call the aborigines of America a different origin and creation from the other branches of the human species. Treating the subject historically, it would certainly have been a great omission to have passed by those theories without a notice, especially when it is the direct object of my arguments to shew the futility of such speculations by the evidence of facts.

But besides those theories founded upon scepticism under the guise of philosophy, there are others accounting for the origin of the American Indians, which can neither be passed over unnoticed, though we may assign no value to them to require any lengthened remark. The first to which I allude is, that the Indians of America were descendants of antediluvian inhabitants of the world, who were not comprehended in the general destruction of the deluge: the second, that there probably was, in some early period after the deluge, some great convulsion of nature, as in the days of Peleg, when some writers suppose the earth was divided into its present proportions, previously to which there were direct communications by land over the whole extent of the globe, either on the Atlantic or the Pacific side of the American continent could have reached those shores without any obstacle intervening of an ocean to be crossed over.

The first of these theories may scarcely be thought requiring an answer, though it may receive one as involved in that which the second certainly has reason to claim. To this second theory, then, of the American continent having been, at some early period, joined to the other continents by lands, over which animals as well as men had originally passed, it is alone that I direct a reply. That the world has been, at different periods, subjected to convulsions of sufficient extent to break up any connecting lands that might have formerly existed between Europe and America, or America and Asia, is indubitable from what we have recorded in history, as well as from geological deductions. With the exception, however, of Plato's myth respecting the island Atlantis — on which, notwithstanding the authorities that may be cited in its favour, I do not think any reliance can be

placed, as it appears to me to admit of other satisfactory explanations—there is no record or tradition in any part of the world of such changes having been made since the deluge in those particular parts where the connecting lands can be supposed to have existed. If they ever did occur, it must have been at a very early period, which, indeed, is the supposition of those who advocate this theory, to account for the numerous population found by the Spaniards in America, divided into so many distinct nations, speaking entirely distinct languages. If we could not account for this state of the population in America by other more probable means consistent with the habits of man as a migratory being, then we might feel bound to assent to that theory, notwithstanding the absence of all historical authority in its favour. But when we can find facts of constant frequent recurrence, of men seeking voluntarily, or driven violently into new abodes, I think it would be extremely unwise to strain after a fanciful solution of a question, which is of itself so easy of explanation otherwise.

Whether the deluge took place only at the period at which the common computations assign it, or from one to two thousand years earlier, as Dr. Hales and Bishop Russell have more correctly shewn it to have been, it appears to me clear, from all we can judge of the state in which the American Indians were found at the beginning of the sixteenth century, that they were then only of comparatively recent immigration, and neither from their numbers, nor from their political condition, likely to have been descendants of tribes or persons who had proceeded thither so long time back as before, or even some centuries after, the deluge. This is also the opinion of one of the best of the earlier writers on America, shortly after the conquest, Joseph Acosta, who visited the New World about fifty years after the discovery, and whose work was first published in 1586. He says, "Qua etiam ex re magis adducor ut putem hunc novum orbem occidentalem non multis abhinc annorum millibus habitatum." This his commentator, De Laet, understood to mean, that he did not think America had been then inhabited from more than one to two thousand years. "Si recte mentem Acostæ capio, vult haud supra mille aut ad summum duo millia annorum Americam habitari coepisse." To this opinion, however, De Laet dissents, on the ground of the vast population which America shewed at the time of the Spanish invasion, and of the great number of languages and nations into which that population was divided. But the amount of the population at that time was evidently exaggerated; and

even if not exaggerated, was not inconsistent with a date of two thousand years back; while the variety of languages, traceable, as they no doubt might have been, into a few groups, as in the other continents, might have been fully explained by other causes into which we have hereafter to enter. Horn, and other writers on the origin of the American Indians, have been less opposed to the view of Acosta, which we should remember is the more worthy of admission, as he had passed so many years in the New World, and that so soon after the Spanish conquests as to give him decided advantages over the others. That his opinions were well founded we may feel warranted in asserting, from every later consideration beyond the learned Jesuit's individual impressions. Since his time, many writers, and especially those who were natives of America, have looked on the remains of former inhabitants of that continent, found there, as if they were of incalculable antiquity, and the works of what they are pleased to call "mysterious races." Later researches have dispelled much of this illusion. Of the two semi-civilized empires of Mexico and Peru it was too evident, from their own traditions, given with a particularity which almost amounted to history, that they had no pretensions to an antiquity of more than a few centuries preceding the conquest. But there were other remains to which the authors to whom I refer love to assign an immeasurable antiquity; 1st. The mound-like works on the eastern coasts of North America; 2dly, The larger mounds of the west, or the valley of the Mississippi; and, 3dly, The ruined cities of stone found in Yucatan and Central America. With regard to the first, Mr. Squier,* in his late excellent work on the "Antiquities of the State of New York" (Buffalo 1851), expressly says, "None of the ancient works of this State, of which traces remain displaying any considerable degree of regularity, can lay claim to high antiquity. All of them may be referred with certainty to the period succeeding the commencement of European intercourse" (p. 9.). This fact he proves from the later investigations having uniformly found in them articles of European manufacture, which, being seldomer, or very rarely, found in the mounds of the west, he seems to consider a proof of their greater antiquity. But as the works only vary in size, and not in character, the conclusion seems more reasonable, that the difference might be ascribed only to the circumstance of the one locality being

* Whose authority I feel great pleasure, from personal knowledge of he Author, in acknowledging as deserving of our entire acceptance.

more in communication with Europeans than the other. That the mounds of the west could not be of much greater antiquity than their cognate works of the State of New York may be deduced from another fact which Mr. Squier has pointed out with regard to them, though without perceiving the argument which may be deduced from it. At p. 302 of the same volume he says, "To understand clearly the nature of the works last mentioned, it should be remembered that the banks of the western rivers are always steep, and, where these works are located, invariably high. The banks of the various terraces are also steep, ranging from ten to thirty and more feet in height. *The rivers are constantly shifting their channels*, and frequently cut their way through all the intermediate up to the earliest-formed or highest terrace, presenting bold banks, inaccessibly steep, and from fifty to one hundred feet high. At such points, from which the river has in some instances receded to the distance of half a mile or more, works of this description are oftenest found." He goes on to say, "It is a fact of much importance, and worthy of special note, that within the scope of a pretty extended observation no work of any kind has been found occupying the latest-formed terrace. *This terrace alone, except at periods of extraordinary freshets, is subject to overflow.* The formation of each terrace constitutes a sort of semi-geological era in the history of the valley, and the fact that none of the works occur upon the lowest or latest-formed of these, while they are found indiscriminately upon all the others, bears directly upon the question of their antiquity."

From this clear statement of a fact of such important bearing on the question, it seems to me that a conclusion quite different from what the talented author would maintain is inevitable. The latest-formed terrace alone being subject to overflow would be a sufficient reason for the builders of those remarkable mounds to avoid erecting their works on them, whether erected for habitations or other purposes: therefore, if still found erected in their vicinity, and out of the reach of places subject to overflow, while the rivers are constantly shifting their channels, it is clear that they have been all erected while the country had the same general character as at present. They shew evidences of skilful design in the choice of places selected for erection; and the latest-formed terrace, therefore, must have existed when they were built, so that no great variation in the course of the rivers can be supposed to have occurred since, though they are so constantly shifting their channels.

As to the character of the mounds themselves, of which

we shall have occasion to speak hereafter, it may be as well here at once to declare, that as there is nothing in them peculiar to America, so neither is there any type in them of antiquity. Dr. Beck, in his "Gazetteer of the States of Illinois and Missouri (p. 308), says, "One of the largest mounds in this country has been thrown up on this stream (the Wabash), within the last thirty or forty years, by the Osages, near the great Osage village, in honour of one of their deceased chiefs. This fact," he says, "proves conclusively the original object of these mounds, and refutes the theory that they must necessarily have been erected by a race of men more civilized than the present tribes of Indians. Were it necessary, numerous other facts might be adduced to prove that these mounds are no other than the tombs of their great men." Without assenting entirely to this last assertion, as Mr. Squier has satisfactorily shewn that some of the mounds must have been erected for other purposes, yet one such fact, recorded by so respectable an authority as the above, will be sufficient to dispel the idea of any mysteriousness hanging over their origin, or of that origin being of any very remote antiquity beyond that of their fellow mounds of the State of New York. Of the stone structures in Mexico, Yucatan, and Central America, neither can we predicate any very considerable antiquity. The buildings in course of erection at Mexico when the Spaniards first arrived there proved the date of all others of the same class in the country to be not far removed from that period; and though the Mexican traditions pointed to an earlier people, the Toltecs, yet they shew that these were only a cognate people, speaking the same language, possessing the same religious rites and civic characteristics, and only preceding them a short time in their migration. Even if the Mexican histories, therefore, are to be relied on, and the same remark applies to the Peruvian also, the era of their civilization, or pretensions to civilization, can only be referred, at the utmost, to a few centuries before the arrival of the Spaniards. The ruins in Yucatan and Central America I feel empowered to say, from personal examination of some of them, may be ascribable to an earlier age and civilization than the Mexican; but at the same time I feel confident that they cannot be considered of higher antiquity than the remains we possess of Greek and Roman art, at the very utmost. Mr. Stephens, in his "Incidents of Travel," seems to have considered it a rare discovery that he had found a lintel of a door of wood, in a sound state, at Uxmal, to prove it of comparatively recent date, but I am able to say that it is of no rare oc-

currence, as I found not only wooden beams, but also laths, in a yet sound state, in several places, of different ruins in Yucatan.

On the whole, judging that the civilization to which these ruins in Yucatan and Central America owed their origin was a distinct one from that of the Mexicans and Peruvians, whose semi-civilization again was equally distinct from the state of society of the Indians to the north and south of their respective empires, it seems to me still equally certain that the various tribes found on the American continent had all arrived there many centuries after the other continents had been peopled, and only when those other continents had become fully peopled. The next question, then, for consideration of the subject I have undertaken, is, to ascertain whence those various tribes of American Indians had proceeded.

Before more fully entering on this inquiry, fearing I might be thought by some guilty of an omission if I were not to refer to an opinion held by a great number of writers, that the Indians were descendants of what they call the lost tribes of Israel, I feel compelled to notice it also. The number of writers who have maintained this opinion, or who have allowed it as probable, is so great as to be really astonishing. If they have any readers in the present day relying on their lucubrations as worthy of an answer, I will, in deference to them, go so far as to be observe, 1st. That the ten tribes, as they are called, were never lost at all; and next, that if they were lost, as alleged, there cannot be any the slightest recognisable analogy shewn between the Jews and the Indians, in respect of either language, religious rites, political institutions, or physical characteristics. The absurdity is almost as great as that of another suggestion made on the subject,—that the inhabitants and animals found in the New World had perhaps been carried over by angels,—so extraordinary are the devices to which some persons will have recourse to make marvels of very obvious and natural occurrences.

It would be an almost endless task to detail the various opinions which have been maintained, even by writers of acknowledged judgment and ability, respecting the peopling of America, with any attempt to canvass them minutely. I proceed to examine them as succinctly as the time during which I may trespass on the attention of the Society will admit.

Of the earliest writers on the subject, the greater number held that the progenitors of the American Indians had come

over the snowy regions of the northern parts of the world, from Scythia or Tartary, which theory Grotius thought he had triumphantly overset, by remarking that the Scythians were preeminently pastoral people, and had horses and herds of cattle, of which the Americans had no knowledge; whereupon he supposes that they had come over originally partly from Norway, and partly from Abyssinia. The latter supposition is such an extraordinary one, as to make us doubt what could be his meaning. If he intended all Africa, we cannot altogether admit the correctness of the opinion, nor yet of their having come from Norway, even if, under this name, we suppose him to intend all the north-western parts of Europe. That there were circumstances inducing numbers of the Scandinavians to seek new habitations in Iceland and elsewhere we admit; but we have neither authority nor reason to believe that any people analogous to the red or copper-coloured Indians ever inhabited that part of Europe. There might possibly have been some nations formerly inhabiting Scandinavia distinct from those settled there within historical memory, of whom we have no record or tradition: but we have trustworthy accounts of the first peopling of Iceland by its present race of inhabitants, and at that period we know it was a desert island, from which, therefore, there were no such tribes to be driven away. Grotius seems to have fixed on Norway and Abyssinia as the two nearest countries to the American continent from which men, possessed of seafaring knowledge could have passed over, without, however, entering into any inquiries to judge of their ethnological affinities. But in so doing, he forgot that the same arguments might be brought against his suppositions, which he considered so conclusive against the others. For if the American Indians could not have come from Tartary because they had no knowledge of horses or cattle, neither could they have come from Norway or Abyssinia without a knowledge or possession of the animals found in those countries. But we cannot admit his argument to be a valid one. If some of the American tribes had originally proceeded from Scythia or Tartary, having been possessors there of horses and cattle, those who came to America may well be presumed to have come, not of free will over the inhospitable regions of the north, but as wanderers and fugitives. Some might have come as hunters, and some from the restlessness of spirit characterizing uncivilized people; but the greater part we may presume came over the ice and snows of the north as weaker bands driven away from their former habitations by stronger parties in their native communities.

If, then, we suppose they had thus to traverse those vast icy regions in hasty flight and fear of pursuit, where no subsistence could be found for their horses and cattle and, scarcely any for themselves, it is all but certain that they must soon have lost, or have had to kill, the animals they had brought with them, and their descendants in a very few generations — and we can give them centuries in the interval — could not fail to lose every knowledge or tradition of their existence.

Our great historian, Dr. Robertson, after the full consideration he gave the subject, came to the conclusion that the American Indians came originally from the north-east of Asia, and he has in this opinion been followed by the great majority of modern writers. He says, "The vicinity of the two continents of Asia and America renders it highly probable that the human race first passed that way from Asia. In latitude 66° N. the two coasts are only thirteen leagues asunder, and about midway between them lie two islands, the distance from which to either shore is short of twenty miles. At this place the natives of Asia could find no difficulty in passing over to the opposite coast, which is in sight of their own. They might have also travelled across on sledges or on foot; for we have reason to believe, from the accounts of Capt. Cook and his officers, that the Strait is entirely frozen over in the winter, so that the continents during that season, with respect to the communication between them, may be considered as one land." — "We may therefore conclude," he adds, "that the Asiatics, having settled in those parts of America where have been discovered those approximations of the two continents, spread gradually over its various regions." He concludes that the progenitors of all the American nations from Cape Horn to the south limits of Labrador, from the similarity of their aspect, colour, &c., migrated from the north-east parts of Asia, and that the nations which inhabit Labrador, Esquimaux, and parts adjacent, from their unlikeness to the American nations, and their resemblance to the northern Europeans, came over from the north-west parts of Europe.

Whatever degree of respect we may think justly due to the opinion of so eminent a writer, I feel compelled to say that this one does not seem to me free from objections. The latitude indicated, 66° North, is that of Behring's Straits, where, and 10° still further south, the cold is so intense as to affect even spirits of wine; and though undoubtedly the Strait is entirely frozen over the greater part of the year, and people can go over in sledges and on foot, the natives who do so now are the Esquimaux, the present inhabitants

of those regions, and who, as he acknowledges, bear no resemblance to the other nations of America, but a strong one to some of the northern Europeans. With regard to them, therefore, the learned historian has to suggest another origin, — that they are descendants of Norwegians and Icelanders, adopting the theory of Grotius, but applying it to another people. If, however, this theory is at all admissible, it must be on the supposition of the progenitors of the Esquimaux having been inhabitants of Norway and the north of Europe prior to the Scandinavians, by whom they had been driven to the extreme north. The peopling of Iceland, as before observed, comes within the limits of history, and we know that when first inhabited by the Scandinavians they found it uninhabited. It cannot be intended that the Esquimaux were to be supposed of the same family as the Scandinavians, considering the vast difference in their language, manners, and physical appearance; though we may admit that the first tides of emigration might have carried to the north the people from whom the Esquimaux are descended, and that they had been driven there at a very early period, so as to have made them at length become inured to the climate, and the mode of life it necessitated. Such a people, so inured to the climate, were the Esquimaux when the Norwegians first reached their shores, and, in their surprise at seeing them so different from themselves, called them Scrælings, or dwarfs, shewing that there was no affinity whatever, at that time, between them. It could be only long years of privations and endurings of hardships that could enable the Esquimaux to traverse over those icy regions with the facilities they have learned to practise; but they are very different people from the other almost numberless nations of America, in its vast extent from Cape Horn to the south limits of Labrador, who cannot be supposed, therefore, to be derived from their stock. These nations, it should be remembered, had also a great variety of languages, and, though bearing a general resemblance among themselves, yet nevertheless had still among themselves a number of strong distinguishing characteristics. It is scarcely possible, therefore, to suppose, under these circumstances, that they all came across the snows of Behring's Straits, and to have had the means of subsistence for that purpose, or the necessary defences against the inclemency of the climate, so as all to have been the same, or cognate people from the same quarter, and divided after their arrival in America, as they were found to be divided. Before any people would expose themselves to the severe climate of

the north, and to a passage over a frozen ocean, the opposite shores of Asia must be supposed further to have become densely populated, to make it necessary for any portion of them to go away on any hazardous journey. But even in the present day we cannot find that the extreme north-east shores of Asia are at all so densely populated; and the conclusion altogether, therefore, seems inevitable, that although some portion, and even a large portion, of the American nations might have come across by those straits, yet they were not the ancestors of all the American nations, nor yet of the greater part of them.

The same remarks apply in a great measure to the opinions of the latest writer of eminence on the subject in our day, Dr. Latham, who observes, "I believe that if the Pacific coast of America had been the one first discovered and fullest described, so that Russian America, New Caledonia, Queen Charlotte's Archipelago, and Nutka Sound had been as well known as we know Canada and New Brunswick, there would never have been any doubts or difficulties as to the origin of the so-called Red Indians of the New World, and no one would ever have speculated about Africans finding their way to Brazil, or Polynesians to California. The common sense *primâ facie* view would have been admitted at once, instead of being partially refined or partially abandoned. North-Eastern Asia would have passed for the fatherland to North-Western America; and instead of Chinese and Japanese characteristics creating wonder when discovered in Mexico and Peru, the only wonder would have been in the rarity of the occurrence. But geographical discovery came from another quarter; and as it was the Indians of the Atlantic whose history first served as food for speculation, the most natural view of the origin of the American population was the last to be adopted, — perhaps it has still to be recognised." ("Man and his Migrations," p. 122.)

From this it appears that the learned writer, giving in his adhesion to the supposition of one only means of arrival of the so-called Red Indians into America equally with Dr. Robertson, would, however, give them a lower range of places of transit of from 10° to 15° further south, even if he does not also allot for them China and Japan as their "fatherland."

On the other hand, another late writer, Dr. Lang, in his "Origin and Migrations of the Polynesians," while falling into the same exclusiveness of ascribing one only source of origin for the American Indians, deduces their migration

from another direction. He says "there is abundant reason to believe that America was originally peopled from Asia, not, as is generally believed, by way of the Aleutian islands as the entrance of Behring's Straits, but by way of the South-Sea islands and across the widest part of the Pacific Ocean" (p. 86). All these writers, I venture to suggest, are correct to a certain degree in their suppositions as to the localities from which migrations actually took place, but mistaken in supposing any one of them to have been so exclusively of the others.

The whole population of America, when discovered by Columbus, has been estimated at about forty millions. This I consider to have been a rather exaggerated estimate; but still, taking it as correct, if they had all proceeded from one only source, it appears to me almost impossible but that they must have been more intimately connected with one another by language, manners, and character, than the various divisions shewed them to have been in reality. Some writers, in the face of this difficulty, have endeavoured to maintain that the various languages of the different nations of America, though so apparently distinct, were yet all formed upon essentially the same basis; and with regard to their manners and character, as proofs of an identity of origin, have adduced a number of analogies, which, however, on examination will be found only such as are common to the whole race of mankind. To answer their purpose, they should have passed over those common analogies, and dwelt only on those found peculiarly in some families distinctly from others, constituting the real difference between them; and they should also have explained why some of the most remarkable peculiarities are found among different nations of America according to their localities, in which peculiarities the neighbouring nations do not in any way participate. In the same manner with regard to their languages: when they allege that these are all, in the American continent, of the same character and structure, they should have shown how, in these respects, they are different from the other languages of the world. This has mainly to be taken for granted upon their statements, with the exception of a fanciful theory of what Du Ponceau called Polysyntheticism, and Humboldt and others have termed Agglutination; but the vocabularies and grammatical structures of the languages given in the valuable Essays of the American Ethnological Society, and other works published on the subject of those languages, certainly do not shew any material difference between the structure of the native languages of America

and that of the rest of the world. Many of the old suppositions, in fact, arose only from an imperfect knowledge of the languages, and were adopted from a few isolated cases to maintain an imaginative generality. The more carefully we undertake to examine the common general treatises on the grammar of the various American nations, the more certainly we shall find them as distinctly marked in groups as are the languages of the other continents, and having clearly traceable connections with the languages of the other continents, so as to have no more a peculiar identity of structure with one another, than the respective groups may evidence of Asiatic or other foreign origin.

These views are now fully admitted by the later writers of America, as Van Amringe, in his "Natural History of Man," and Professor Rafinesque, of Philadelphia, who seems to have studied more than any other the native languages. The former, while referring to Du Ponceau's edition of the "Leni Lenape Grammar," says — "The whole grammatical arrangement of language, from vowels and consonants to prosody, is arranged in the savage tones of these unlettered barbarians substantially upon the same principles as in the elaborately polished languages of Europe" (p. 532). The latter, Professor Rafinesque, says — "The theory about the common exclusive grammatical structure of all the American nations is erroneous, and based upon partial facts. (See "American Nations," Philadelphia, 1836, p. 65.) Since the time of Du Ponceau a more discriminating class of philologists has arisen in the United States, among whom we have to name Professor W. W. Turner, whose labours for the Smithsonian Institute demand our respectful attention, and Dr. Francis Hawks, the learned translator of Rivero's "Peruvian Antiquities." These writers state, directly in opposition to the fanciful theories of their predecessors, that "our materials respecting the Indian languages are as yet too scanty to justify sweeping general assertions, and that it is not true that they are all characterized by what Du Ponceau called Polysyntheticism, though it doubtless exists in many instances." (Hawks' "Rivero," New York, 1853, p. 119.) In the same work it is also stated by Rivero himself, a native of Peru, who had made the antiquities of his country his peculiar study, that "the American languages are susceptible of geographical division, some being soft, with principally vowel terminations, and others harsh, with terminal consonants" (p. 114). In conformity with these distinctions, accordingly, we further find some writers discovering decided analogies between various American lan-

guages and those of north-eastern Asia on the one hand, and other writers shewing as decided analogies between some American and Polynesian languages on the other, all equally deserving of the fullest investigation.

From these considerations, then, it seems a natural consequence that the inhabitants of America did not all proceed from one only source, and that those opinions, therefore, are erroneous which are founded on that supposition. Other writers, as Garcia, De Laet, and Horn, who have pointed out a number of different countries and localities from which the first settlers might have come, as Horn says, rather than positively limiting them to a particular route, appear to me to hold correcter opinions.

The same kind of events that we see, even in our days, of frequent occurrence, and know to have been of frequent occurrence in history, we may reasonably conclude to have been the universal rule with regard to man in the course of his migrations. When we see that there is scarcely an island in the ocean on which inhabitants have not been found, and frequently, in comparatively small islands, that two or more distinct tribes are found speaking distinct languages, those languages, as the Polynesian with its numberless dialects, often spread over immense areas, over which it is difficult, at first sight, to discover how they could have arrived at their respective localities, we see clearly still in operation the laws of migration by which the world has been peopled from the beginning. In one of the most recent works on the subject, Mr. Pickering's, the author traces two great routes of emigration from the East Indies into the main Pacific, at the same time that he indicates other modes by which the Polynesian Islands have become inhabited. (Chap. xvii.) Agreeing with him in his observations on these points, though not concurring in others, it appears to me that he might well have extended his conclusions further than he has done, and that the wandering tribes who had been so traced to those islands could equally well have been followed to the mainland of America. Even in our days we know of Japanese vessels, which had been engaged in commercial pursuits being driven by storms to the shores of America; and such occurrences have been reported to have occurred constantly in former times. In Ellis's "Polynesian Researches," in particular, many such cases are detailed. But besides peaceful pursuits, we may be sure that in every uncivilized stage of society the various stragglers who wandered over the ocean in search of abodes were often impelled by more numerous and more pressing motives. Uncivilized nations,

whether of earlier or later ages, have always been characterized by the same barbarous treatment of their captives. When any tribe was attacked by a more powerful one, or when one party in a state, in the course of civil dissensions or personal animosities, had to succumb to their enemies, the weaker party had no other resource for safety but flight. If the seas were open to them, whatever might be the insufficiency of their means of transport, there was still for them a chance of escape from imminent destruction; and thus the same causes which have often led to the foundation of powerful states, must have often led to colonies of the savage tribes, who ventured themselves from time to time on the Indian and Pacific Oceans, to escape from enemies still more dreadful than the waves. If the small islands in those oceans, often more than a thousand miles apart, were all thus, some time or other, discovered and peopled, as proved by the affinity of languages prevailing throughout those seas, or by the physical characteristics of the inhabitants — as, for instance, Otaheite and New Zealand, which are 2000 miles apart, without any land intervening, and yet, when discovered, were found to have the same language spoken in them — we may well conclude that an immense continent like America, in the course of so many ages, could not fail to have been reached and peopled by the same kindred tribes also. The same events having been in operation for unknown centuries, even if not begun until Asia had become fully populated, there would have been ample time for the peopling of America to the extent it was peopled when discovered by Columbus, as well as for that of the remoter islands of the Pacific. But from the diversity of tribes and languages found in the new continent, allowing for the natural increase of the immigrants in their new abodes, and considering their relative numbers, all very limited even among the most populous nations, according to the most probable computations, it appears to me clear, that no large migration had ever taken place at any one time. On the contrary, they seem to indicate that the American Indians were all descendants of small bands of fugitives, say of tens or twenties, or perhaps, at the utmost, of a few hundreds, who had succeeded in reaching those shores after being exposed to much labour and many dangers in so doing: and though numbers no doubt might and must have perished on the way, yet if only a few couples had succeeded in establishing themselves safely in localities favourable to the preservation of life, they would have been amply sufficient, in the course of, say, only 2000 years, to increase to more than double the numbers at

which they were estimated when the Spaniards arrived amongst them.

Let us not, however, undervalue the means of transport possessed even by very barbarous people over those seas which they had to traverse in the more benignant climates of our globe. The accounts of our voyagers abound with notices of the vast numbers of canoes with which they were surrounded on reaching newly-discovered shores. Mr. Squier records a statement of one of the first settlers in New Hampshire, that the tribe of the Penacooks, at the time of their destruction by the Maquaas or Mohawks, had three hundred birch canoes in Little Bay, and that they had seen as many there at that time (p. 148). These three hundred canoes we may certainly calculate could have carried off a thousand persons, if the owners had chosen to fly instead of staying to encounter their enemies to their extermination', and thus they might have found refuge in some of the West-Indian islands. But some of the canoes are represented to have been of really astonishing dimensions. Without referring to the fleets of vessels, some of four hundred tons burden, mentioned by the Portuguese in the seas of Asia, with the knowledge of the mariners' compass, Ferdinand Columbus and Diaz del Castillo both state there were found some, on their first visiting the West-Indian islands, capable of holding forty or forty-five persons each; and Peter Martyr says there was one having as many as eighty rowers. If we consider the state of discipline necessary to manage such vessels and crews, and the provision necessary to be made for their maintenance, we must acknowledge that there were sufficient means at the command of those tribes to remove themselves bodily by sea in long voyages, so that, in the comparatively smooth waters of the tropics, they might have transported themselves from very long distances to the places in which they were found by Europeans of different nations.

In this one respect, then, it appears to me that the various authors to whom I have referred are correct in supposing the Indians of America to be descendants of fugitives from very different parts of the ancient world, the far greater part of whom undoubtedly came from Asia, though from different parts of Asia to different parts of America, at many and different periods of time, and possessing different degrees of barbarism or semi-civilization. Such different bands of fugitives, if meeting at any time, and commingling either as friends, or even as conquerors and conquered, would in the course of two or three generations become a people with a language and character difficult to be traced to either line

of progenitors, as few persons could be found so intimately acquainted with the original languages of either line as to be able, under perhaps a pronunciation vitiated with regard to both, to ascertain their origin.

It is too much the practice of Ethnologists to string together a number of names of the people they recount, without considering that they may all be of the same family or nation, or, at any rate, without shewing that they are really distinct. In a geographical point of view, it is no doubt correct to give the local names of the people inhabiting the several localities; but Ethnology requires that no distinction should be made where there is no specific difference. As Humboldt has well observed "to accumulate facts without generalizing an idea, is as sterile in history as it is in philosophy." The true value of such knowledge is to gather from them what is essential for the object of our researches, and so use particular data for general specifications.

On the other hand, it is too much the fault of travellers to dwell on generalities. Thus there has been no agreement among writers on the American Indians greater than to pronounce them all, from their alleged general resemblance, to be people of the same origin, or, as Cieza de Leon said shortly after the conquest, and Sir R. Schomburgk has repeated before this Society, to be "all children of one family." This general resemblance is certainly very great; but, as Von Humboldt has correctly observed, it has been much overstated; and those who become really conversant with different nations of America very soon become enabled to note the great differences actually discernible between them: yet still, no doubt there is also a great general resemblance among them, inasmuch as they all shew decided evidences, in their general appearance, of their origin from what is commonly called the Mongolian race, predominant in Asia. But, as in Asia itself there are many nations with very distinct characteristics, so their descendants in America — taking here for granted that they are their descendants — must also be expected to have as equally distinct characteristics, perhaps even more markedly distinct, arising from their further wanderings and comminglings in their new abodes. If, then, the theory be correct, of the American Indians being traceable to different parts of Asia, the inference may be expected of analogies existing in respect of language, and manners, and physical appearances of the various nations respectively in the two continents, which it next becomes a part of our task to point out.

I know there has latterly been a supposition of races now

extinct having formerly existed in America, not only from the works and remains of ancient skill and labour, but also from the shape of the skulls sometimes found there, supposed to be of a different conformation from that of any people now existing. The former ground of opinion, founded on a supposed unascertainable antiquity of the remains of handiwork, I trust I have already sufficiently answered. The latter, arising from the different shape of skulls, appears to me susceptible of the same answer, though, as an unprofessional dissentient, I feel more hesitation in disputing the theory. Still, when I look around in vain for any well recognised bodily representatives of Greek or Roman skulls, nay, of our own island races of more than a thousand years back, and doubting the preservation of the bones of any beyond that period without artificial means being adopted, I cannot attach any value to the deductions formed from a few crania, whose history is all founded on conjecture, and which may have been only those of some barbarous people who had some peculiar fancy for distorting the head, as many savage tribes are known to have done in later times. If any people had ever existed in America of a different conformation to the rest of mankind, within the limits of time during which their crania could have escaped the law of returning to the dust from which they were formed, we cannot suppose they could have become utterly exterminated, so as to leave no representative of their species within the limits prescribed to history, especially if they were the builders of such works as yet remain in Peru, Mexico, and Central America, or even of the mighty mounds of the valley of the Mississippi.

Turning, then, from the insubstantialities of hypothesis to the realities of facts, without attempting to enter into minute particularities, we may observe, with regard to North America, that there seem to have been two great divisions of people among the Indians inhabiting the eastern and western countries of that continent. They both bore the general colour and appearance of the Mongol, or Asiatic race, but those on the west alone had the obliquity of eye peculiar to the Mongolians, that peculiarity extending down to Mexico, Central America, and still further south, evidencing their origin from the Mongols of the north-west of Asia. In the eastern countries of North America this strongly-marked peculiarity was not found, as Dr. Morton has also stated in his great work, "Crania Americana;" while the Indians there were distinguishable by manners equally indicative of their distinct origin. With respect to these I do not wish to strain

after many common analogies between similar customs of people of different countries, as painting or scarifying their bodies, because there are so many of these so obviously common to man, in every age and quarter of the world, as to be rather inherent instincts of his nature than peculiar national distinctions. But there are others of a strange and extraordinary, some even of a revolting character, which must be supposed to have originated from some peculiar idiopathy, rather than from the suggestions of our common nature or human feeling. In these respects, then, while we find the nations of the east and west sides of North America equally savage and bloodthirsty, yet those on the east had some particular customs or practices unknown to those of the west; or, if not unknown, yet not in general use among them; such as the wampum, the calumet or pipe of peace, the shaving of the head, the practice of scalping, the rite of circumcision, and the building of mounds. All these customs or practices are clearly traceable throughout what we may call Scythia or Tartary, especially that of building mounds, which, common as they are in the eastern half of North America, are still more common throughout Siberia and all Tartary, from which quarter, therefore, we may conclude that the progenitors of that family of American Indians originally came. With regard to the mounds, a late American writer has observed — "From Dr. Clarke's travels it appears ancient works exist in various parts of Asia, similar to those of North America. His description of them reads as though he was contemplating some of those mounds. Vast numbers of them have been discovered in Siberia and the deserts bordering on the empire to the south. The situation, construction, appearance, and general contents of these Asiatic tumuli and the American mounds are so nearly alike, that there can be no hesitation in ascribing them to the same race." (Priest's "American Antiquities," Albany, 1838, p. 56.) The other practices are equally identical, and that one of scalping is mentioned by Herodotus, so far back as his time, as Scythian. It is true that the American mounds are less in number and magnitude in those parts now constituting the British provinces and the northern states of the Union; but when we consider the rigour of the climate, impelling the wandering tribes to seek more genial habitations to the south, we may reasonably judge they had passed hastily through the northern provinces in their journeyings over the frozen regions; and it was only when they arrived in what they considered settled abodes that they reverted to their old national customs. It is also in this way we are to ac-

count for the American mounds, though so many thousands in number, yet as not being so numerous, so vast, or so abounding in valuable and curious deposits as the Asiatic, because, as the works of colonists, if we may use the phrase with regard to the builders, they could not be supposed to be so numerous, so settled, or so wealthy, as the inhabitants of the country from which they sprang. Such analogies and considerations, *primâ facie*, give us considerable reason to expect that we ought to look for the origin of the various American nations in the countries to which they refer; and thus, according to the theory I maintain, the Ethnologist ought to look to Tartary, to compare the languages yet existing there throughout its whole extent with the languages of the people on the eastern shores of North America; while to trace the origin of the various tribes on the western coasts, down to Central America, he ought to compare their languages with those of the nations who inhabit the eastern parts of Asia. Were this course to be sedulously followed, I feel persuaded that very extraordinary analogies might be discovered, and the question of origin and unity of race even might be settled. To effect this object, it must be necessary, not only to accumulate vocabularies and grammars, but also to arrange them in a manner to admit of the easiest reference. For this purpose, then, I should wish to see carried out, with regard to different divisions of continents, the course adopted by our Government when they ordered a general vocabulary of the principal languages of Western and Central Africa to be compiled for the use of the Niger Expedition (London', 1841). Such general vocabularies would, I feel convinced, be found of invaluable assistance for the comparisons desired.

In the same manner, tracing the people of Central and South America, from the Polynesian Islands, from China, Japan, and other countries of Asia, as far as India, we may expect to find in their languages equal analogies. That there was considerable intercourse between the two continents from a period long anterior to Columbus, can scarcely admit of a doubt. Ranking, in his "Historical Researches," has produced some very ingenious arguments to shew that the Peruvian empire was founded by the remnants of a Mongol army that had been sent to conquer Japan, but which had been driven off from that island by a storm, so that none of those composing it had ever returned to their own country. Though we can by no means assent to all his conclusions, yet we must acknowledge that he has adduced strong probabilities of some connection between the Inca dynasty and

the empire of the Mongols. De Guignes has shewn, from the Chinese annals, that the existence of a civilized power in America had been known in China before the time of Columbus; and Mr. Squier, in the work to which I have several times referred as the most careful and trustworthy of American works on the subject, has distinctly stated, though somewhat contrary to what seem his own predilections for the theory of an aboriginal civilization, "that in India are found the almost exact counterparts of the religious structures of Central America, analogies furnishing the strongest support of the hypothesis which places the origin of American semi-civilization in southern Asia" (p. 249). Other writers have pointed out the analogies of languages between various nations of South America and the inhabitants of Polynesia; as Dr. Barton in America, Vater in Germany, and Lang in his "Origin and Migrations of the Polynesians." The latter author, though he has also been led away too much by his theory to give it an exclusive operation, has shewn the identity of the peoples, so as to make it almost a certainty, that if we had such vocabularies as before suggested of South American and Polynesian languages carefully drawn out, we might be enabled clearly to trace the affinities of perhaps every nation on the continent. Beyond these authorities, if we compare the handiworks and manufactures of the one with those of the other people, I think there can be no doubt remaining in our minds of their being of the same origin. On this point I content myself with referring to the valuable work published at Vienna in 1851, entitled "Peruvian Antiquities," to compare the representations therein given of those remains with the articles from Polynesia in the British Museum and other museums, in corroboration of these statements.

In all these cases the suppositions point to an Asiatic or Mongolian origin for the great body of the American Indians, which would account for their strong general resemblance. But it is not the less probable, in the presence of this fact, that there might still have been found on the American continent descendants of colonists from other parts of the world. The Esquimaux, as before mentioned, have been generally considered of European origin; and though later researches have tended to shew a strong probability of that people belonging rather to the north of Asia, we may coincide in the belief of their having affinities with the white race of mankind from their complexion, though they have the oblique eye, and perhaps other features, more akin to the Mongols. Whether it was these people whom Grotius

and other writers supposed to have come over from Scandinavia, it seems to me a fact, as certain as any that history presents, of the Scandavians as we now know them having found their way across the Atlantic many centuries before Columbus. I am even ready to believe that they had come across more frequently, and had penetrated further even than what their records testify. We must not always rely on the silence of history to put a negative on any particular question, any more than we can rely on its assertions for an affirmative. From Norway to the American continent there is generally found a favourable wind blowing to waft a vessel across the ocean, and thus many a small vessel may have had no other resource than to go before the wind, driven over by storms against which they could not make head, and of which no remembrance has been recorded, even though some might have returned. With this persuasion in my mind, I can readily admit, as probably true, the traditions of Welsh and Irish colonies having also crossed over the Atlantic, as well as the better authenticated ones of the northmen, some of which might have soon perished from violent or natural causes, and some, in the course of a few generations, have become so swamped among the natives as to lose all knowledge of the strangers that had arrived there among their ancestors. Under the circumstances supposed, of vessels driven across the Atlantic, it is unnecessary to argue that females could not have been present in any proportionate numbers; and if the men had to form any associations with the natives, so as to leave a mixed progeny, that progeny might have shewn their origin by a fairer complexion and greater intelligence than their neighbours, as the Mandans for instance, and other tribes both of North and South America. In such cases, even if the unfortunate castaways had been of a superior class of persons in their own country, their progeny would naturally grow up with the habits of the mothers, rather than with a knowledge of the civilization of their fathers. Nay, it is probable that these would soon forget the knowledge of civilized life themselves, and, in a new state of society, with the pressure of new wants, sink into barbarism, rather than continue superior to it. That there have been numberless cases of vessels driven or drifted across the Atlantic we have abundant instances. Even if we doubt the story, which I must say I do not doubt, of the mariner who is stated by many respectable authors to have given Columbus positive information of lands on the other side of the ocean, I think I can gather from his son's narrative that he had heard of such

reports; and when he arrived at Guadaloupe, on his socond voyage, he found there the poop of a vessel which had been very probably wrecked in the neighbourhood. We know, also, that, only five years after Columbus had achieved his great discovery, the Portuguese admiral, Cabral, on his way to the East Indies, was driven by strong winds on to the coast of Brazil, which casualty would thus have given the knowledge of a new continent to the civilized world, even if the energies of Columbus had not been previously directed to that object. The like circumstances have driven many vessels, in more modern times, from the old world to the new; and the same must have frequently occurred in former ages, as, indeed, we may judge from the positive statement of various authors to that effect, equally in the cases of people proficient in the art of navigation, and those possessing the most limited knowledge of it. The same events, again, before referred to with regard to the causes of migrations, must be expected to have arisen in all parts of the world; and as we have contended that the main body of the American Indians proceeded from Asia, though admitting the probability of some of them being associated with descendants of stray Europeans, we may, on the same grounds, assent to the probability of some African nations or tribes also having found their way across the Atlantic, to mingle their race and languages with the people they might happen to meet there.

The older writers on the origin of the American nations, such as Garcia, Horn, and De Laet, have laid very great stress on the probability of the new continent being, in a considerable degree, peopled from Africa. They maintained that America was in reality, from very early times, known to the Phœnicians, or at any rate to the Carthaginians; and that the ancient inhabitants of the Canary Islands, generally designated Guanches, and other African tribes down the western coasts of Africa, had been, some of them, from time to time driven or drifted across to Brazil and other eastern coasts of South America. As before observed, these opinions may be received as probable, on the same principles which we have acknowledged to be just with regard to the other wanderers from the Old World to the New: and much as some later writers have discredited the idea of the new continent having been known to the ancients, I feel bound to say, that I feel as much assured of the fact as of any event in history. The Greeks and Romans certainly are not to be included in this supposition, and much less the Jews or Egyptians, who were not sea-going people;

but we have sufficient references in classic authors to lands on the other side of the ocean, to feel assured of some indistinct rumours of such lands having reached them, and those rumours were most probably obtained from Phœnician or Carthaginian sources. It would be foreign to the purposes of this essay to enter fully upon this proof; but it will be sufficient for me here, in connection with the subject, to observe, that the hypothesis seems to me most correct, of the civilization which formerly existed in Yucatan and Central America having owed its origin to the Phœnicians, who, as being immediate neighbours to the Jews and to the Egyptians, no doubt held many of their customs in common with them, so as to account for what few Jewish or Egyptian analogies have been found in that part of the New World. Many very respectable Greek and Latin authors, it is true, whose inquiries led them directly to the subject — Pliny and Strabo, for instance — have no reference to any such knowledge, perhaps because, having no sea-faring persons to consult on it respecting such extraordinary particulars, they forbore to enter on any discussion of what they could neither assert nor deny. But there are at least ten or a dozen no less respectable authors of antiquity who have given such notices of other lands, some fully, others slightly and incidentally, but not the less trustworthily, as to make it a matter of surprise that scholars should have passed over them so almost unnoticed. Modern investigations, also, seem to me to prove the fact incontestably. The ruined cities of Yucatan and Central America, existing almost entirely on the sea-coast, and decreasing sensibly as we proceed inland, shew that they owed their origin to some foreign maritime people, rather than to any indigenous civilization. If that foreign people had been Phœnicians or Carthaginians, they would no doubt have brought numbers of other African nations in their train, besides those who had found in their way across, independently of them, over the comparatively smooth waters of those regions, where the smallest and worst-founded boats have only to run before the wind, and, with the current, must ere long have reached the opposite shores. These, and any other wandering tribes found in the interior, a civilized people would soon have gathered under their dominion. Many of those who came over at the same periods might have also formed independent communities, as the Guanches, whose peculiar mode of desiccating their dead may be believed traceable in the remains of some of the ancient inhabitants of America reported by different writers. The religious rites of

Yucatan, as detailed by the Spanish conquerors, were very distinguishable from those of the Mexicans, and shewed a different origin. When visited by the Spaniards, the descendants of the earliest settlers had evidently much degenerated, and, shut out from all later knowledge of modern arts, could not make head against the firearms and weapons of their invaders. Their race, accordingly, was soon extirpated, even if it had not been extirpated previously, at least in effect; and the opportunity of learning their traditions having been lost, we have it now only left us to judge from the remains of their cities, as from the foot of Hercules, the proportionate extent of their former civilization. The full consideration of this topic would require a volume much beyond the limits for which I can claim your attention; but this much may be allowed me, in discussing the subject before us, to account for what so many writers have been fancying a mysterious aboriginal civilization of an extinct race peculiar to America. Civilization, it is indubitable, flourished there in a remarkable degree; and as myself an eye-witness of its traces, and humbly venturing an opinion the result of considerable study and research, I feel no hesitation in submitting it, even thus incomplete, to your judgment, as owing to Carthaginian colonization of about eighteen hundred years date back from the time of the Spanish invasion, degenerating gradually until that time, when the few who could have explained it were extirpated unheard.

After this civilized intercourse with the New World, and before the time of Columbus, there were probably many cases of African tribes or fugitives finding their way to America, as Asiatics had done on the other coasts. When Columbus first arrived at the islands he found them generally inhabited by a timid people, who seem to have been of the same nation as those inhabiting Yucatan, from the fact of their all speaking a language dialectically different, but intelligible to one another. This fact we learn from Peter Martyr, the most intelligent and fullest of the cotemporary historians. Though he never visited America himself, yet he sought out most sedulously all the information possible from the various adventures who returned thence, to be repeated to the Pope and other princes of Italy, for whom he seems to have been an agent in Spain. His letters, accordingly, are among the most minute and trustworthy records of the times, written in the way such important events deserved to be communicated; and as he died in 1526, having shortly before returned to his native Italy, we have from

him an authentic narrative of what was observed by the first conquerors, as if written by themselves. From him, and also from the life of Columbus by his son, translated in Churchill's "Collection of Voyages," we learn that the discoverers fell in with several tribes of savages of a darker colour than the general body of Indians, and some of them actually black. One of these tribes is described by Peter Martyr in terms expressive of their having been negroes, and, if negroes, they must be supposed to have crossed over from Africa. Whether they had any affinity to the general body of the nation or people known as the Caribs does not appear; but independently of them, as they dwelt on the main land, there was found a widely-diffused tribe of a dark colour and peculiar ferocity, throughout the islands, designated Caribs or Cannibals. These names were given them by the other Indians, the word "Carib," as Peter Martyr informs us, "in the language of all these countries signifying 'stronger than the rest,' and was never uttered by any of the other islanders without dread." This people seem to have been then but newly arrived in those islands, some of which, as the Spaniards were informed, they had lately depopulated. Peter Martyr considered their original country to have been what he and the Spaniards called Caribana, situate on the east of the Bay of Uraba, on the main land. They were, however, evidently too intractable a race to submit to any intercourse with the Spaniards, whereby any satisfactory information might have been obtained; and though the name Carib might thus have been given them extraneously, yet, as they seem to have taken it as their own, it might possibly have been also their proper name, as in Africa are found people bearing one of a similar sound, Karabàs and Carabalis. It was upwards of a century and a half after the conquest before the attention of inquiring minds was turned to their history, when two French writers gave the fullest and most interesting account of them and their language that we possess. The first was M. De Rochefort, who published in 1658 his "Histoire Morale des Antilles;" and the second, Father Raymond Le Breton, who published in 1665—66 his Carib Grammar, Dictionary, and Catechism. The latter has treated only of the language, while the former not only gave a distinct corroborative Vocabulary of it, but also endeavoured to investigate their history, so as to have at least the merit of affording valuable assistance to all future inquirers on the subject. That he might not have been altogether correct in his conjectures does not at all detract from his merits; and, canvassing them freely, we must fully

acknowledge our obligations to him for the information given us. Were all travellers to adopt the like plan of writing the "moral history" of the people they visit, and in advisable cases to favour us with like vocabularies, they would enhance the value of their works by enabling future philologists to trace the changes of languages, and perhaps even the origin of the people. M. Rochefort's work was translated into English by Mr. Davies, of Kidwally, printed in London in 1666, who, however, did not name his author, as he ought to have done, though acknowledging his own to have been translated from the French, so that the subject of which he treated became known to the literature of England as well as of France. Other writers had also referred to the Caribs, though not so fully. Rochefort refers to one whom I have not seen as an authority for some of his statements, as well as to a friend, an Englishman named Brigstock, of whom he speaks highly, as having lived much among the Indians, and acquired great knowledge of their customs and languages. From the latter he obtained a theory of the Caribs having proceeded originally from Florida, which, though evidently contrary to his own judgment, which assigned their origin to South America, he gives at great length, and with more particularity and respect than was due to it. Besides these, there were afterwards some other writers of lesser note, to one only of whom I think it necessary to refer here, Père Labat, who published, in 1724, an account of his residence among the Caribs. These writers all dwell on the certainly remarkable fact, that among the people the men spoke a language distinct from that spoken by the women. In all ages, and in a variety of different countries, we find, or trace, the circumstance of a chief's, or court language, existing, distinct from that spoken by the people; as in China in the present day, and as in England under the Normans. In some other instances, also, we learn of distinctive words in a nation as used by each sex respectively; in America particularly, as noticed by Mr. Gallatin, and among the Basques in our immediate neighbourhood, as mentioned by Lecluse. But I am not aware of any nation being so distinctly marked out in this respect as the Caribs, whose history, therefore, seems to me deserving of particular attention. We can readily conceive the fact as necessarily ensuing from the kind of warfare ever carried on by barbarous nations, when the men who were overcome by an invading enemy were mercilessly slain, and the women alone preserved for the victors. If the women, then, possessed a different language, the pro-

geny would naturally grow up speaking a mixture of both languages, as the English has grown up a combination of Saxon and Norman French. The main ingredient in such a case would probably be the language of the mothers, as that which is earliest learned on the mother's knee may be supposed to leave the deepest impression on the mind. This would form the staple and framework of the new language, for instance, the form of the verbs; as we find in the English language a vast majority of the verbs are derived from the Saxon, while the nouns may be perhaps mainly taken from the French or Latin. The terminations, however, of the nouns would be altered, in one case or the other, according to the speakers, and thus the grammarians would be enabled to designate them as masculine or feminine. It would depend much on the relative numbers of the conquerors and conquered as to what proportion of their respective languages should be retained, but they must soon be expected to amalgamate; and if they did not, as in the case of the Caribs, amalgamate for upwards of two hundred years, it was probably, in their case, owing to their peculiar ferocity of manners. The earliest writers inform us that there were several islands inhabited only by women, whom the men used to visit at stated times, having, it seems, devoured the men. On those visits they took away the boys as they grew up along with them, leaving the girls with their mothers. Besides these, we are told that the men treated the women they had with them with singular contempt, as if on account of their being of a different race, not allowing them to eat with them or to sit even in their presence. They were, in fact, their slaves, forming a society of their own among themselves; and if, as was probably the case, the boys were brought up with the fathers and the girls with their mothers, the two original languages might be kept distinct for an indefinite period. Though an extraordinary and curious circumstance, we may thus account for this distinct peculiarity continuing among the Caribs for so long a time as we have shewn — for upward of 200 years, until the time of Labat. That it arose from a band of foreign invaders having come, killing the men and enslaving the women, is very evident. It has been already suggested that this occurred not long before the arrival of the Spaniards, as they were already there when Columbus reached the islands, which they were devastating, driving the more peaceful Indians into the interior of the larger islands for safety. Between their arrival, therefore, and the time of Le Breton and Rochefort about 200 years

might have elapsed; and notwithstanding the distinction of languages existing, it will be difficult to suppose that they continued entirely unaltered. It is not improbable that, in the course of those 200 years, the transition natural in such cases would have been begun, of two distinct languages amalgamating to form a third, and thus that the verbs might be mainly derived from the language of the mothers, and the nouns from the language of the fathers. Since Le Breton's work of 1666, I am not aware of any investigation made of the Carib language, until the translation into it of St. Matthew's Gospel by the Rev. Mr. Henderson, of Belize, Honduras, in 1847. I had the pleasure of forming the acquaintance of this estimable clergyman in 1851, at Belize, and he then shewed me a vocabulary of the Carib language as now spoken, which he led me to hope would have been printed before now. Finding this has not been accomplished, I have been obliged to confine my inquiries into the present state of the language to that translation of St. Matthew, and from it obtain a full confirmation of my suppositions. My only surprise is, that even now, after the lapse of about 400 years, so much proof still remains of the origin of this people. It is to their probable origin, therefore, that I have now to ask your attention.

Respecting this, Rochefort seems not to have had a very clear opinion. He acknowledges that their own traditions generally referred to what he supposes to have been South America, but he had learned, from his friend Mr. Brigstock, a confused history of their having been a people driven from a northern country, which he concluded to have been Florida, by some Indians whom he calls Apalachians. That there might have been some such outcasts from Florida we have no reason to dispute; but neither have we any good ground to conclude they afterwards became the people known as the Caribs. Robertson, and other writers, have followed P. Martyr in ascribing their origin to South America, where many powerful tribes of their nation certainly were found along the coast from the Orinoco to Essequibo, and throughout the whole province of Surinam to Brazil. If they had been driven away from Florida by a stronger people they could scarcely have settled down in South America and the islands in such numbers as they were, and there was no nation found in Florida that could be supposed to have been strong enough to have driven them away. But further, if they had been driven away from Florida, it is most natural to suppose that they would have been found on the islands near Florida and to the north ot Cuba and Hispaniola. But

in the Bahamas none except the most timid race of Indians were found, and it was on the islands of the south where the Caribs actually were settled, and it was the southern shores of Cuba and Hispaniola which they infested. On these grounds, Bryan Edwards dissents very justly from this hypothesis; and observing that the Caribs seemed to him to be an entirely distinct race from the other Indians, widely differing from them in physical appearance and manners, he framed an opinion that they were in reality of African descent, and that their ancestors had come across the Atlantic. Before referring to Bryan Edwards, I had come to the same conclusion, from what had come under my observation of this people. Their general appearance and features, notwithstanding their straight shining hair, gave me the idea more of the African than the American Indian; and the fact of their having come from Africa was not, even according to Rochefort's account, inconsistent with their traditions, as these merely stated that they had come by sea from a far country, without distinctly shewing whether it was from the east or the west. But in his very candid account of their condition, notwithstanding it militates against his own hypothesis, Rochefort mentions one very curious fact, which seems to me to negative completely the supposition of their having come from South America. Having stated the circumstance of the Caribs in the islands having two distinct languages, one for males and another for females, he tells us that the Caribs on the mainland of South America had only one language both for males and females, and that this was the same language as that spoken by the females on the islands. It seems clear from this that they could not have come from South America, because, if they had, how could they have lost their language and adopted another? On the other hand, if some of their nation, on coming to those regions, had settled on the continent, being fewer in number to the original inhabitants, they might very easily, in the course of time between Columbus and Rochefort, have forgotten it, and adopted that of the women, which the people on the islands had not done, on account of their different position, and their proportionate numbers to the women. Bryan Edwards observes, that even to the end of the last century an insensibility or contemptuous disregard to the females was a feature peculiar to the Caribs; and he notices, among other African customs among them, that they disfigured their cheeks with deep incisions and hideous scars, different from the other American Indians in their neighbourhood; that they had a habit of chewing what they called betele, as

mentioned by P. Martyr; and that their women wore a sort of buskin, or half-boot, made of cotton, which surrounded the small part of the leg, as worn by the women of various nations of Africa, but not by any other of America. He might also have noticed their use of the tomtom, or African drum, mentioned by Rochefort, formed from the hollow trunk of a tree, and covered only at one end, like our kettle-drums, and other African musical instruments, such as gourds filled with pebbles or small peas for rattles, and one made of gourds, on which they placed a cord formed of the string of a reed, which they called Pite, together with the inordinate love of dancing, characteristic of Africans beyond the customary dances of the other Americans.

Impressed with the conviction of the Caribs being of African descent, Bryan Edwards finally turned to their language, and, as he says, by the help of a friend, collected fourteen words, or phrases to which they fancied they found their coincidents in Hebrew. Had this really been satisfactorily done he might have reasonably set them down as Jews; but having gone carefully over the list, I cannot find more than one or two words they have selected that bear any resemblance, as they allege, and those few so slight as to deserve no further notice of the supposed analogy. His proper course would have been to compare the words given in Le Breton's Dictionary, or Rochefort's Vocabulary, with those of various African languages, so as to trace, if he could, any satisfactory resemblance between them, and shew the former to have been derived from the latter. In accordance with the theory suggested before as to the best means of shewing the descent of the various American tribes from their original abodes in Asia or Polynesia, I felt myself possessed of a great advantage for this purpose in the well arranged vocabulary compiled for the use of the Niger expedition, with the still more able and elaborate dissertation on the African languages by Dr. Latham, in the Transactions of the British Association for 1847. Supposing the Caribs to have come over from Africa, as they must have done, according to this hypothesis, about 400 years since, and considering the changes which must be calculated on as taking place in all languages in such a long space of time, it is impossible for us to expect that any very extended comparisons can be made, especially in the case of savage nations subject to so many mutations. The only wonder is, that any allowable analogies at all can be pointed out after such a lapse of time, and the satisfaction will be, therefore, proportionate, if we can shew coincidences as great, and as many, as have

warranted Dr. Latham in assigning the various languages of Africa to certain groups, in the way he has done. If it be objected that they are not found all of one particular African nation, it may be a sufficient answer that these languages are so nearly allied, as to convince us they are only dialectically different, and that four hundred years since they might have been less distinct from one another than they are at present. I believe I shall not have to quote any one African language which is radically different from the others, knowing that many African nations and languages are often designated by different names, when they are in reality identical. At any rate, the languages referred to are all of the western nations of Africa, taken from the vocabulary, so often mentioned, for the African words, and from Rochefort and Le Breton for the Carib. The modern Carib has full one half of the words different from those given by the French authors two hundred years since, and I find the adoption generally of the women's language mentioned by those authors, to which are there no sufficient analogies in the African to warrant my repeating them. Those which I think will prove my suppositions are as follows, premising, that as the Carib words are taken from French authors, they must have given them a French pronunciation; and also that my means of comparison are very limited, half the words in the Carib vocabularies being wanting in the African, and, *vice versa*.

English, Man.
Carib, Ouekelli.
Kongo, Iakelā.
Ako, Okori.
—
English, Father.
Carib, Baba.
Ako, Baba.
Fulah, Baba.
—
English, Son.
Carib, Inimou.
Ako, Omò.
—
English, Younger Brother.
Carib, Ibiri.
Yoruba, Aburo.
—
English, Daughter.
Carib, Iamouiri.
Yoruba, Ommobiri.
—
English, Head.
Carib, Ischic.
Ibu, Ishi.
Fanti, Mitshi.
—
English, Head.
Carib, Boupou.
Woloff, Bope.
—
English, Eye.
Carib, Akou.
Ako, Oyu.
—
English, Hair.
Carib, Iou.
Ako, Iru.
—
English, Tooth.
Carib, Ari.
Ako, Ehi.
—
English, Skin.
Carib, Ora.
Ako, Awor.
—
English, Shoulder.
Carib, Echè.
Ako, Ejika.
—
English, Blood.
Carib, Itta.
Ako, Eja.
—
English, Breast.
Carib, Ouri.

Ibu, Arrah.

—

English, Hand.
Carib, Oucabo.
Ako, Awo.
Uhobo, Akuongo, } Abo.
Karaba, Uboh.

—

English, Foot.
Carib, Ogouti.
Karaba, Ukut.

—

English, Sun.
Carib, Hueyu.
Ibu, Awu, Auu.
Ashanti, Ouia.
Fanti, Euia.

—

English, Moon.
Carib, Nonum.
Ako, Ona.

—

English, Animal.
Carib, Arabou.
Ako, Erako.

—

English, Pig.
Carib, Bouirokou.
Ashanti, Fanti, } Beraku.

—

English, Dog.
Carib, Auli.
Sereres, Oulley.
Mandingo, Wula.
Bambarra, Wulu.

—

English, Serpent.
Carib, Hehue, Aha.
Ako, Eyo.

—

English, Dead.
Carib, Aoueeli.

Ibu, Angwale.

—

English, Asleep.
Carib, Aronca.
Ibu, Arona.

—

English, Day.
Carib, Ouarrou.
Fulah, Jurru.

—

English, Basket.
Carib, Alaouatta.
Ibu, Ukata.

—

English, Bed.
Carib, Akat.
Ako, Akète.

—

English, Bowl.
Carib, Akaë.
Ibu, Aka.

—

From these various considerations, therefore, now submitted to your notice, namely, from the personal and moral characteristics of the Caribs, from their manners and customs, and especially from the analogies of language compared with those of Africa, or rather with the dialects of the one language which I believe formerly prevailed throughout the western coasts of Africa, now broken up into the dialects to be found there under different names, I trust you will come to the same conclusion with myself, that it was from Africa they had their origin. It may, perhaps, be said, that the words which I have shewn of the same import in the various African languages might have been introduced among the Caribs by the Africans brought over by Europeans as slaves. But this cannot have been the case in fact, because, taken as the words are generally from Le Breton's Dictionary of 1665, slaves had not at that time been introduced in any large numbers into the plantations, and the few that could have escaped from the plantations to seek refuge among the Caribs cannot be supposed to have had such influence among this people as to make them give up their language for that of a few fugitives who might have so come among them. In coming from Africa they had no doubt a long voyage to undertake; but we must remember that, when once afloat,

whatever might have been the impelling causes, they had only to submit themselves to the winds and waves to be carried with little difficulty to the islands on the other side. We know, from Peter Martyr and other writers, that they had no small means and skill of so transporting themselves to great distances. He says, "They sailed in fleets of canoes to hunt after men, as others go to the forests to kill deer;" and that they had sufficient energy to undergo great enterprises was shewn from their resistance to the Spaniards, of whom, the same writer says, "they had overthrown and slain whole armies." From their appetite for human flesh, learned not improbably in Africa, they would have been able to obtain sufficient sustenance for the long voyage across; and if only acquired by the necessities of that voyage, or strengthened by it, we need not be surprised at their systematic hunting after it in their new abodes. Under the influence of a long communication with the whites, though so harshly begun, they have long since abandoned that horrible practice, and all the later accounts of them represent them now as of docile and amiable dispositions. There are a few families of them, I understand, yet surviving in the islands of St. Vincent and Trinidad; and on the mainland there are several villages, for whom, as I have already stated, the Gospel of St. Matthew has been translated into their present jargon. In this I find comparatively few words of the language of the fathers: the greater part consists of those of the mothers' race, with a number of others from the French, Spanish, and English languages, and perhaps some of other neighbouring people.

In the third volume of Hakluyt, p. 577, are fifty-seven words of a language recorded as collected by Sir Robert Dudley in Trinidad in the year 1595. Of these I can only find a small number agreeing with those given by the French writers as being Carib. I have no decided opinion to offer on this diversity, and only mention the circumstance to point it out to other inquirers for such explanation as they may be able to offer. I have compared them with the neighbouring languages, the Maya and Musquito, and find them entirely distinct. I suspect they were in reality Carib, but incorrectly written down.

In conclusion, returning to the coincidences which have been laid before you, if it has been satisfactorily shewn you that there was a widely extended nation of savages in America of manifestly African origin, this fact must be acknowledged to be a warranty for the arguments being well founded, that the other nations of America had also

originally proceeded from the other continents, in the same manner, at former periods. For the lower animals we may readily assent to the doctrine of separate creations in different countries suited to their respective climates. When the earth was ordained to bring forth each living creature after its kind, it is an inference fairly allowable that it was a law of the God of nature, perhaps to be of long-continued operation, to suit such creatures to their peculiar localities, beyond which they could not live healthily. The phrase used in the Hebrew לְמִינָהּ, in our version translated "after its kind," seems to me rather to require the interpretation "according to her kind," as referring to the earth; and this explanation renders unnecessary any question as to how the animals found on the new continent came there, or how they proved to be of different species from those of the other continents. But to man was given a constitution fitted to endure every climate, with intelligence to provide for every want wherever his wishes or his requirements might lead him. With the command given him to replenish the earth and subdue it, the power to do so was also given, and it has been extended to the savage no less than to the civilized man. I concede the question to the advocates for distinct creations of "primitive men" to account for the difference of races, that if any such distinct creation could be supposed to have taken place anywhere, the America continent, so recently opened forth to our knowledge, with its multifarious varieties of the animal and vegetable kingdoms, might have been expected to present the most satisfactory traces or evidences of the fact. But when we find this new continent not only not offering us any such evidences, but the very contrary, and when we can so clearly shew it to have been peopled from the other parts of the world, we may unhesitatingly reject this doctrine as in reality inconsistent with facts and experience, and therefore as being unphilosophical, at the same time that it is at variance with our sacred records.

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTICES OF THE AMERICAN INDIANS THE MAYAS, THE CARIBS, THE ARRAWAKS AND THE MOSQUITOS.

READ

BEFORE THE ETHNOLOGICAL SOCIETY

THE 14th MAY, 1856.

On the 15th March 1854 I submitted to the judgment of this Society a paper on the probable origin of the American Indians, the object of which was 1st to combat the theory put forward by some writers, that there had been in the beginning of time several distinct creations, of what they pleased to call "primitive men" to account for the apparent diversities observed among the various races of mankind: and 2d to show that the numerously different nations of America had not sprung from any one single source as other writers had imagined, but that they had severally proceeded from different parts of the Old World at different periods of time, and at different stages of barbarism or semicivilization.

In support of the first assumption I contended that if for the sake of argument it could be supposed probable, that there had been originally such distinct creations of primitive men, then that the New World so recently opened forth to the notice of civilized observers might be certainly expected to afford the clearest and most satisfactory evidences of the fact. Instead however of any such evidences being found, and notwithstanding that the animal and vegetable kingdoms there presented entirely new forms of life to those known in the other Continents, the human race alone presented no new type whatever peculiar to that Continent, or in any respect different from what was observed in the Old World. As in the Old World there were varieties of make and color found there, but all evidently the effect of natural causes, as some tribes were found speaking the same language and thereby evincing the same immediate origin, who yet were

distinguishable from one another by different tints of color dependent on the localities where they resided. Thus to use Dr. Prichard's words "the identity of speech among these wandering tribes was the proof of a common origin, which otherwise would not be believed." Phys. Hist. vol. v. p. 457. Physiologists have sought in vain for any inherent differences in the conformation of different families of man, in the skull or skeleton, so as to convince us of any such inherent differences existing, and the conclusion seems inevitable, as the result of their enquiries, that, whatever differences have been actually pointed out, have been only the natural effect of accidental causes. Some have been led away by the different hues and tints impressed on the inhabitants of different parts of the world, and upon this ground have described and considered them as so many "varieties of man." But those who have entered most carefully into these enquiries, inform us that the character of the skin is essentially the same in all the variously colored families of mankind, and to all observers professional or otherwise, it is a matter of the most palpable nature, that this outward texture of our frame is most easily influenced by climate, or exposure, or other circumstances, so as to assume a lighter or darker color accordingly. Such being the case, it ceases to be a subject of speculation, to enquire into the different colors of different nations, inasmuch as all those who live in the same country and under the same habits of life and exposure to the climate may be expected to gain thereby a general resemblance of color, which might be confirmed or extended through a course of various generations. All observation shows the tendency, and almost every narrative of travellers will afford us instances. Even in the case of individuals exposed only for a few years to certain influences of climate and modes of living, we know I may say of our own knowledge and observation of the most remarkable changes occurring in this particular. Voyagers to barbarous countries have frequently told us of wanderers from civilized life who have associated with savages, becoming soon undistinguishable from those savages in outer appearance, and such accounts are given in narratives, where no supposition could be entertained of any intention to deceive. When Cortes first arrived on the coast of Yucatan, he heard of two Spaniards who had been wrecked there eight years previously. One of these he succeeded in rescuing from the Indians, the other refused to return to civilized life. The former named Geronimo de Aguilar, says the trusty old trooper Bernal Diaz when given up "was not in his appearance to be distinguished from a native, and he had

hardly the pronunciation of his own language; his only words at first were Dios, Santa Maria and Sevilla. His color was as dark as that of a native, and he was marked like them. When he came into the presence of Cortes, he like the rest of his companions squatted upon his hams and every one was looking for the Spaniard. At length to the enquiry of Cortes he replied 'here he is' and then coming forward was supplied with proper clothing." Heating's Translation of B. Diaz p. 38. When such cases can be referred to as of frequent occurrence of changes in individuals, what reasonable ground can there be for doubt with regard to the varieties of color in families or tribes subjected to the same influences of climate for unknown generations? And this consideration leads us to another, as to the reasonableness of those theorists, who dwelling only on varieties of tints of color, without any other deviation whatever in form or features, pronounce different colored people to be distinct races, merely on such accidental and evanescent qualities, as if they were of an innate and permanent character. In opposition to such theories it appears to me unphilosophical and unsound in Ethnology to use even the common phrase of 'Varieties of Mankind' founded on such differences, as erroneous in itself and leading to greater errors. Such views lead us into multiplied confusions, whereas sounder judgement would rather wish to simplify science and show how different people approximate, rather than exaggerate their divergencies. Of all attempts at Ethnology, those are the idlest which encumber the science with long lists of names without meaning and without any pretension to discriminate between different tribes, whether of the same family or not. This error has been carried to the greatest extent with regard to the inhabitants of America, and suppositions have been entertained of endless subdivisions and languages among them, which later investigations have shown to be very mistaken. These investigations show that numberless tribes spread over immense areas belong in fact to a few families, the origin of each of which again becomes an interesting and proper subject for Ethnological enquiries. Those writers who venture on such enquiries unprepared with properly extended views, involve themselves in difficulties consequent on too narrow a conception of their subject, from which they would have easily escaped by taking more enlarged grounds of discrimination. The greatest of our authorities on Ethnology, our late eminent President Dr. Prichard, seems not to have been clearly decided on this point, for at the close of his great work on the Physical History of Man he says, "With

these facts before us I think we cannot admit the supposition that the American race is naturally and instinctively different from the rest of mankind," and then adds as a summary conclusion, "there seems to be no great difficulty in the supposition that people from some tribe or tribes of the extreme north-east, crossed over Behring's straits, or passed along the Aleutian chain of islands from Asia to America in an early period, and formed a nation in the New World, who after constructing or rather developing into its complex form a primitive speech, of which all the polysynthetic idioms are derivations or imitations, spread themselves over the whole continent of America, and being thereby scattered, soon separated into particular hordes, which became the germs of many particular nations." Here however he felt a difficulty, which he meets by observing that "the number and diversity of languages at the present day require, that we should assume an early æra for this event, and the rapidity, with which the human species is propagated under favourable circumstances removes any difficulty that may attend the supposition."

From this passage it appears that the eminent writer declaring himself opposed to the supposition of the American race being naturally and instinctively different from the rest of mankind, was yet inclined to accept the commonly received opinion of all America having been peopled from the north-east of Asia, and afterwards divided into the different nations with different languages found on the Continent by the Spanish and other subsequent discoverers. He makes no reference to any other theory, though throughout his work there are sufficient indications which lead to very much more extended sources of origin for the different people described. Had these more extended views been presented to Dr. Prichard's attention, I cannot therefore but believe that he would have accepted them rather than the old theory, which he found prevailing and which he preferred to the supposition of the native "American race being naturally and instinctively different from the rest of mankind," as other writers had ventured to assert and some are even yet still asserting. But as these considerations had not been then put forward, it becomes the more incumbent on me after having raised them in opposition to the other theory to take every means of showing their validity. In the infancy of every Science, the steps by which the candid enquirer proceeds must be necessarily uncertain, and it is only by careful and continual advances that he can hope to proceed securely. The light afforded to Ethnological knowledge has

been so much increased by later researches, as to make us feel confident, that, if so acute an observer as Dr. Prichard had been able to profit by them, he would have written in much more decided terms than he has done of the miscellaneous character of the American population, especially when he has touched so closely upon it in his own enquiries, as must have led him to the same conclusions, had he not been evidently biassed by too high a respect for the judgment of those who had preceded him. These remarks apply also in a great measure to the Baron von Humboldt, who in like manner has given too ready an assent to the assertions of previous writers, as to the peculiar general uniformity of structure of the American languages. This was principally, if not altogether founded upon a fanciful idea of polysynthetism or agglutination, as they called it, propounded by Du Ponceau, but which, as I showed in the Paper before mentioned, has been given up by the later and better informed writers of the United States as incorrect and untenable. As this theory has been received by so many writers, including Dr. Prichard, with more credit than it deserved, I will venture, though at the risk of being considered tedious, to show its unsatisfactoriness in itself, and its insufficiency if correct, to be a proof of the American languages being different in structure from the other languages of the world. Dr. Prichard says, "To understand the difference between the American mode of agglutination and the ordinary composition of words in many other families of languages, we must observe that the American idioms make up new compounds from a number of small fragments of simple words, and again treating these compounds as if they were simple vocables mutilate or contract them to form other aggregate words." He then goes on to say that the Basque language does the same, though not to carry the peculiarity so far, and then gives instances of what is referred to, one from Du Ponceau and the other from Heckewelder. "When a Delaware woman," says Du Ponceau, "is caressing a little dog, or other young animal, she will say to it 'Kuligatschis', meaning 'give me your pretty little paw.' The word is thus compounded; K is the inseparable pronoun of the second person, meaning either thou or they; uli is part of the word wulit, meaning handsome or pretty; gat is part of the word wichgat, meaning leg or paw, and schis is a diminutive termination." Now if this trifling had not been admitted by Dr. Prichard, I should not have thought it deserving of notice, and even thus cannot but think the peculiarity claimed for the American languages on such grounds unworthy of a Philologist. Such familiar

expressions are found in all languages and in the English as well as in the Basque or any American. In this very instance there is no pretence for any fragment corresponding to the word 'give' in the compound 'Kuligatschis.' That word 'give' is therefore to be understood, and the abbreviated forms of the other words 'uli' for 'wulit' and 'gat' for 'wichgat', may be easily compared with numberless instances of the same kind in our own language and indeed every other. The second instance Dr. Prichard has quoted is from Heckewelder, and of the same character. He says "The Lenni Lenape express by one word and that not a very long one the phrase 'come with the canoe and take us across the river.' The word is nadholineen. The first syllable nad is derived from the verb naten to fetch; the second hol is put for amochol, a boat or canoe; ineen is the verbal termination meaning 'us', as in millineen 'give us'. The simple ideas expressed by these fragments of words are 'fetch in canoe us;' but its usual acceptation is 'come and fetch us across the river with a canoe.' The verb thus formed is conjugated through all the moods and tenses, which are in the Delaware language very numerous and complicated. Thus nadholawal is the form of the third person singular indicative in the present tense and passive voice; it means 'he is fetched over the river in a canoe'." p. 309. Such are the instances adduced of the system of agglutination, upon which we are called upon to pronounce the American languages formed on a peculiar basis. Had we the new word or new verb conjugated throughout, we might perhaps come to a different conclusion, but otherwise this instance seems like the other a contracted phrase, such as is common in familiar discourse especially among uneducated people in all languages. As in the first instance there was no pretence for a word or fragment of a word answering to the word give — so in this instance there is no letter or fragment pretending to be equivalent to the phrase "across the river." That is therefore to be understood and is selfevidently only intended. It must therefore be thrown entirely out of our consideration of the new alleged compound, nadholineen. Then of the syllables forming this compound, nad as the imperative of the verb naten to fetch is surely no fragment or abbreviation nor is the word ineen the pronoun 'us.' Hol for amichol may be easily supposed a familiar name for a boat, as Bus is for omnibus with us, so the word is merely answerable to "fetch us the boat." The word afterwards given nadholawal, literally 'he is fetched in a boat', shows thus only a combination similar to what may be found in

every language in familiar conversation, and is easily resolvable into its proper divisions. Among all uneducated people especially there is nothing more common in every language than such contractions of words, running them into each other so as apparently to form one, which, to those unacquainted with the language, would seem to be made to become one word followed up with a variety of combinations, through moods and tenses in the same manner. Thus to take a common phrase heard frequently among our lower orders, to whom such a want is as common as among the Delawares to be fetched across a river, let us suppose a man going to a shop and saying "Haporthobacca." Some strange philosopher on hearing this word — some Delaware Du Ponceau on ascertaining its meaning might astonish his hearers by telling them that the English expressed by one word and that not a very long one the phrase 'give me a half-penny worth of tobacco'. 'Give me' is to be understood as in the American instances of 'give me thy paw and fetch me across the river'. Ha is a contraction for half — p is a fragment of the word penny and orth is for worth; o is a contraction for of and bacca for tobacco, all agglutinated together to form a compound, which might be afterwards used with a variety of inflections. Similar to this are the arguments put forward to show a peculiar characteristic for the American languages, which however the good sense and better knowledge of the later philological writers of the United States have repudiated. In truth there is nothing whatever peculiar in the American languages individually or collectively, so far as they are known, different from those of the other parts of the world, as to lead us to conclude them derived from any particular or single origin: consequently however anxious the partizans of the theory of a peculiar origin may be to discover any distinctive characteristics among them, it follows clearly and indubitably, that, as they cannot assume any stronger diversity than this fanciful idea of polysyntheticism, their theory of a peculiar origin must be considered equally assailable. As there is therefore no indication whatever in the languages of America to show a common origin for the different nations found peopling that Continent, so neither was there any ground whatever for coming to the same conclusion deducible from their customs or other characteristics, whether moral, or physical. On the contrary, all these rather gave evidences of different origins. No supposition in this respect can be more erroneous than the common assertion of the various tribes of American Indians having a general likeness in their personal appearance. One of the

most earnest of observers in these enquiries, D'Orbigny, is quoted by Dr. Prichard as saying, and with great truth, "as a general position we may regard each particular nation as having between its members a family resemblance, which distinguishing it clearly from its neighbours, permits the practised eye of the Zoologist to recognize in the great assemblage of nations, all the existing types, almost without ever confounding them. A Peruvian" he concludes emphatically, "is more different from a Patagonian and a Patagonian from a Guarini than is a Greek from an Ethiopian or a Mongolian" p. 296. Such are the terms, in which this distinguished naturalist has written of three contiguous people of South-America; and though I must confess that the assertions he makes appear somewhat startling, yet I should not hesitate to adopt them rather than the commonly received notions of a general family resemblance, running through the entire Continents of the New World. My own observations both in North and South America decidedly lead me to the same conclusions, but before adverting to them, I will illustrate my views by adducing a few more instances to the same effect from authors quoted by Dr. Prichard on the people of America, in support of the theory that the different nations of America came originally from different parts of the Old World, to the inhabitants of which in their successive generations they still show very noticeable affinities. It is not to be expected that positive evidences can be adduced in every case, but if satisfactory evidence can be brought forward with regard to some of them, then the same conclusions may reasonably be asked for them all. The illustrations found in particular travellers, I would contend, might have been given by the greater part of them, had they possessed the necessary qualities to make available the advantages they had in their visits to different countries. Instead however of seeking to make useful their observations the most part deal only in generalities, which perplex instead of satisfying their readers. Thus they give to the people they meet with a variety of different names, without ever taking the trouble to ascertain whether they were not all the same, and sometimes in their own ignorance observing there is some difference in their languages hastily pronounce them to be different, when oftentimes they are only dialects of the same idiom. The science of Ethnology connects the widely spread families of mankind together, and the best informed travellers accordingly tell us in corroboration of its doctrines, that many seemingly distinct divisions of men are in reality very closely connected. The so-called innumerable distinct

languages of North America for instance turn out to be all dialects of five or six at the utmost. Among these is a group, to use a favourite phrase of some writers of languages, to which has been given the name of Athapascan, which name it will be useful to continue for the sake of better mutual understanding. This group of tribes seems from its present geographical position to have been perhaps the last immigration into America, and it would therefore be particularly interesting to enquire into their physical characteristics as well as into their traditions as the most likely to be of recent date and most consonant with truth and probability. Well then, of their physical characteristics, we learn from Sir Alexander Mackenzie as quoted by Dr. Prichard, that they have "round faces with high cheek bones and a complexion between the olive and copper color: small grey eyes with a tinge of red, and hair of a dark brown color inclining to black." Another tribe is described in similar terms, "The color of their eye is grey with a tinge of red; they have all high cheek bones, more remarkably the women." "These," adds Dr. Prichard, "are considerable deviations from the supposed uniformity in the physical characters of the American aborigines" p. 379. Considerable deviations certainly, but no more than what many other travellers have recorded, and therefore all warning us how we give heed to those who have too hastily ascribed to them what Dr. Prichard has here called the supposed uniformity. Sir Alexander Mackenzie himself was struck by the difference, which he remarked between the Chapeyans and the tribes of the Algonquin race among whom he had before travelled, and he thinks that the former were an Asiatic or Siberian people. He says "their progress is easterly and according to their own traditions they came from Siberia, agreeing in dress and manners with the eastern Asiatics. They have a tradition among them that they came originally from another country, inhabited by very wicked people, (the usual legend among exiles driven away from their own homes,) and had traversed a great lake which was narrow, shallow and full of islands, where they had suffered great misery, it being always winter with ice and deep snow. (This coincides of course with the passage by the Aleutian islands.) The next great family of nations in America has been latterly recognized as one under a variety not only of local, but also of general names as Algonquin and Delawares. One of their tribes, the Lenni Lenape, "who look on themselves as the patriarchal stem of this race" says Dr. Prichard, "have traditions, which appear to the best informed persons to be

consistent and worthy of credit, that their ancestors resided many centuries ago in a very distant country in the western part of the American Continent. For some reason now forgotten, they determined on migrating to the eastward. After a long journey they at length arrived on the Mississippi where they fell in with the Iroquois, who had likewise emigrated from a distant country and had struck upon this river somewhat higher up. Their object was the same as that of the Lenape; they were proceeding to the eastward until they should find a country that pleased them. With this nation they formed a confederacy and united their forces against another nation, whom they found in the country eastward of the Mississippi, and whom they expelled from their territory driving them down the Mississippi. (p. 384). Such are the Indian traditions most worthy of reliance as most consistent with probability, and for the natives of North America they clearly point out various tides of immigration from the north-eastern parts of Asia, from Tartary and Siberia, to give them a Mongolian type. Another family of Americans were the Iroquois of whom Dr. Prichard gives fewer details, contenting himself with assimilating them to the Algonquins, though speaking an entirely different language, as all do from the Esquimaux, the most northern people of the Continent, who again are found all along the North of Asia, as well as of America. These then I contend all had their origin from the northern and north-eastern parts of Asia, being essentially of the type termed Mongolian, though coming probably from different parts of the Asiatic Continent and at different periods, they had come with different idioms, and had become more or less affected by the climate of America. It cannot be expected that we should be able to attain to much more than probability with respect to the origin of uncivilized nations, when we know how difficult it is to attain to any with respect to the most civilized. But the whole body and soul of Ethnology may be laid down as dependent on the doctrine that man is a migratory animal. Different from the lower animals, he is not restricted to any climate, but can make himself the denizen of all. We are yet in the infancy of our Science, but I for one have faith in her capabilities to prove from the languages alone of different nations her right to be classed even among the exact sciences. In this view of the case, I feel persuaded that further research will reward the labor of those who compare the languages of North America with those of North Asia, looking on this demonstration as the strongest argument of affinity, though at the same time giving due weight to all

that can be urged on the consideration of customs, conformation, or other characteristics. With this conviction before us, we may proceed to the other tribes on the western coast of America, and without being turned from our course because we do not find any records of each one, refer to those who have been described by travellers and admitted by Dr. Prichard upon their accounts as of the description given.

First the natives of Queen Charlotte's Island are said to be the best looking, most intelligent and energetic race on the north-western coast. "Their natural complexion is as white as that of the people of Southern Europe" (p. 433). To the south of this people are tribes distinguished as Nootka Columbians speaking dialects of the same language as the Northerners, which language is considered by Dr. Prichard to have an affinity with the Mexican. All, therefore, may be different migrations from the same quarter, these Nootka Columbians being described as "of smaller stature, fatter and more muscular; their cheek bones are prominent and their complexion though light has more of a copper hue." This would seem to prove that they had been longer residents in the New World and therefore more affected by its climate. Captain Cook and Mr. Anderson in their account of the people of Nootka also say that "the whiteness of the skin appeared almost equal to that of Europeans; though rather of the pale effete cast, which distinguishes that of our southern nations." La Perouse says of them "the color of their skin is very brown, being constantly exposed to the sun, but their children are born as white as any among us" (p. 443). The people of Norfolk Sound speak the same language as those before mentioned and are described by different travellers quoted by Prichard as having skins as white as that of any European (p. 445.) Here we may pause to enquire, such being the description given by all travellers of the people on this coast, how we are to account upon the theory of one origin, for their being so white, and so different in color from the other tribes of America. It at any rate proves that here at the first starting we have all the difference imaginable to the alleged general uniformity of the American people, and if this difference is to be ascribed to climate alone, which is certainly said to be more like the climate of Europe than any other part of the New World, then the question is given up of color being a criterion whereby to distinguish the so-called Varieties of Man, inasmuch as in that case, color depends entirely on the climate. That color does so depend on the climate, all observation tends to show, and especially when we find various tribes of

different hues speaking the same language and evidently of the same stock, but having their different hues according to their localities. But as color may be certainly ascribed to climate, so it may be positively considered more or less decided according to the length of time, which the people in their generations had been subjected to the influence of that climate. The same effect might be expected whether their progenitors had been of a lighter or darker hue. The coasts above mentioned in the north-west abound in hills often covered with snow and with verdant forests. A few degrees to the south, we come to the climate of California, which is on the other hand dry and hot to an excessive degree; the earth is barren, abounding in rocky and sandy districts, and deficient in water. The inhabitants of this country speak a different language from their northern neighbours, and in color, so far from being like them white as Europeans, are described to be as black as negroes, and having the conformation of the Papuans. Dr. Prichard says, "It seems from this description that color is not the only circumstance, in which the Californians make an approximation to the character of person prevalent in some other tropical countries as among the Negroes of Guinea, New Guinea, and the New Hebrides. The shape of their heads and features may be compared with those of the nations last mentioned" (p. 447). Go again a few degrees south and we come to other tribes of different shades of color, different languages, different conformations as regards stature and figure. Some of great stature and fierce, others mild and diminutive (p. 451), differing in form as well as in complexion (p. 453), as rendering it impossible for us to imagine that the differences could have been of any such recent date as must be assigned them, if they had sprung from one single source of immigration. Some of a coppery hue, some of a yellow tinge, some of an olive brown of different shades from light to bronze, some so fair that they are termed Yucacari or white men, and some tawny approaching to black (p. 473), all contradictory, says Prichard, of the general assertion of uniformity of type among these races (p. 464), and in some as the Quichua nation with moral qualities in every respect strongly in contrast with the character, which some writers would represent as the universal and undeviating attribute of the native races of the New World (p. 466). Without dwelling on the extremes of dark color among some tribes, as the Charryos, or degrees of fairness in others, as for instance the Boroa tribe, or the Mandans, it seems difficult to conceive how any writer could pronounce them under these circumstances to bear all a general like-

ness as children of one family. With regard to the South American nations Prichard has not quoted any traveller, who has given any decided data whereby to judge of their relative affinities, but all concur in ascribing to them such strongly marked distinctive characteristics as to warrant our considering them proofs of distinct migrations from those parts of the Old World where we find affinities for them. The inhabitants of California show themselves allied to the Papuan nations, whence chance colonies of their progenitors had most probably found their way, as in South America other colonies had from the Polynesians. In my former paper I referred to respectable writers, Vater in Germany, Barton in the United States and Dr. Lang in England, who thought they had traced in their several languages the proofs of a common origin. To these I now will only add the authority of Ellis in his Polynesian researches, who considers the Araucanians to be of the same race as the New Zealanders. He says, numerous words in their languages are similar, as also their dress and many of their other characteristics. Vol. ii. p. 46. If these conjectures are correct, the positive proof cannot be far off from being proved, as we have sufficient knowledge of their languages to be able to compare them. At present I take the affinity for granted with respect to the western coasts of America, only stopping to meet the enquiry whether in such cases the tide of migration might be supposed to have set in from the East or the West, that is whether from America to the islands or from the islands to America. Those who would advocate the former supposition, might rely on the course of the winds and currents, as setting in from the East, but these though almost uniformly regular are frequently varied by storms in a contrary direction, by which if any canoes happened to be surprised, they would be inevitably driven to the Continent and once taken there find it difficult to return. That such occurrences have taken place in the history of every seagoing people may be easily remembered by every one. There is scarcely any voyager to be mentioned, however eminent his discoveries, who in the course of his voyagings has not come across the traces of some wanderer, who had preceded him and whose history is only heard of by the slightest incident. Columbus found the poop of a stranded vessel at Dominica, and the renowned Argonaut

> Who first of man's aspiring line
> Launched the oared bark upon the deep

found the shipwrecked sons of Phrixus on the island of Ares preceding him in his course.

The earliest discoverers of the western coasts of America do not seem to have met with any seagoing tribes, while those who first visited the islands of the Pacific were naturally much surprised at the capabilities and aptitude shown by the islanders to undertake long voyages, their knowledge of navigation, and their fleets of canoes. Captain Cook in 1774 estimated one of their fleets to consist of not fewer than 1700 in number each carrying 40 men, making therefore an armed force of some 7000 men. Nor is this on consideration a matter of any marvel. The inhabitants of a Continent with vast tracts of land on all sides of them had not the same inducements to expose themselves to the waves, as those of the islands. They had sufficient space for such culture as they gave it, for the chace or for refuge from their enemies. But the inhabitants of the islands whose ancestors must have been brought to those islands in canoes, and who must have been nurtured on the seacoasts, could not but be rendered familiar with its nature from their earliest infancy, and navigation became one of their greatest needs, and tribes of the same people found their way from one island to another as is proved by the same language spoken throughout the Pacific with scarcely a dialectic deviation. In the Journal of the voyage of the Endeavour in 1770 p. 105, it is remarked that the people of New Zealand spoke the language of Otaheite, though 2000 miles apart without any land intervening between them, "with not so much difference as is found between many counties in England." Taking merely the doctrine of chances as our guide, we may see clearly that the Continent of America must have been reached frequently by different bands of rovers at different periods, who mingling themselves or their descendants with one another, would form new combinations quite sufficient to account for whatever anomalies were found in the New World. These it will be the task of our successors in Ethnology to unravel and explain. We have not sufficient data before us on which to labor, or at any rate not such as to take us from those other tasks, which lie more distinctly before us as the object of our enquiries. To enter on these enquiries, some local knowledge also may be desirable, and at present I only refer to them in illustration of the theory I advanced in my former paper of the multifarious and heterogeneous character of the American populations. The more widely extended those populations became on the New Continent the more they might be expected to vary in their physical and moral characteristics. Their languages equally would become varied, so as to render it almost impossible to trace

them through their variations, and difficult even where no material difference existed. We find such to be the case even with civilized people, and much more must it be so with the uncivilized. A German Gentleman who spoke Danish well, told me that once travelling in Norway he could not possibly make himself understood by the natives. At length he thought of trying whether he could not enter into communication with them in writing and putting his wants and conversation on paper, found he could get on quite easily. Unfortunately such a plan could not be adopted with the savage inhabitants of America.

I turn now to matters which have come under my own observation and give them as illustrations of the enquiries to be made, of the spirit in which they should be undertaken, and the results that may be hoped for. In the Spring of 1851 I endeavoured to carry into effect a wish I had long entertained of visiting the states of Central America and Yucatan, which I was only partially able to do, as my departure there was somewhat unexpectedly delayed. In consequence of this I did not arrive in Honduras until after the rainy season had set in, and the roads in the interior had become almost impassible. I was therefore obliged to limit my visit to voyagings along the coast, for which purpose I hired a small schooner of 60 tons, and in that went yachting about wherever the winds favoured us and wherever I heard of places within my reach described as remarkable and worthy of being visited. In the course of those voyagings I fell in with individuals of three different families of mankind, Mayas, Caribs, and Mosquito Indians, all deserving of more notice than they have yet received at least in this country; and respecting each of whom I have therefore to offer a few observations which the Society may perhaps find coming within the scope of their consideration, without troubling them with accounts of mere journeyings in the way of travellers recounting their adventures. The great object of my visit was Yucatan and the ancient ruins found there, to which however I do not at present refer, as my enquiries respecting them lead to different questions than those I am discussing, but there my principal acquaintance became that with the Mayas, the native population of that district. Of these I had some earlier and better opportunities of observation, having seen many at Havana who had come there some with families emigrating from the Peninsula on account of the intestine war raging there, and some as prisoners who had been taken in arms and sold as slaves to Cuba. I had also taken some

lessons in the Maya language from a native of Yucatan living near me, which though not sufficient for the purpose of enabling me to hold conversation with the people, still assisted me much in forming the opinion I came to respecting them. This opinion was that the Mayas showed decided proofs of a descent from some people having close affinities with the Chinese or perhaps Japanese. The square built figure, the form of the head and features, the flat face, and obliquity of the eye, showed those affinities. Their dispositions also showed the same origin. Unlike the other aborigines of America, who sulked and sank under the forced labors imposed on them by Europeans, these people submitted as patiently as Africans or Chinese. True it is that at length they have risen against their oppressors, and this assertion of their inherent right to liberty has been called a war of races. But this is an unjust ascription. For years they have been subjected to the most cruel treatment, which they have borne with extraordinary patience, treatment described as dreadful by Stephens and still more so by Norman. I lived some ten days among them sleeping even in their company, and more humble, respectful and submissive attendants I never found among Africans during my 14 years sojourning at Havana. The chief peculiarity I am at present able to point out in their language is, that it does not possess the letter R, in this respect also similar to the Chinese and other languages of Eastern Asia; and another circumstance of note with regard to it is, that having before expressed an opinion respecting the Athapascans of their being the last migration of the Mongol family into America, I find one important word, namely for man mentioned by Prichard as used in North America in the Esquimaux language, innuit, in Chapeyan dialect of the Athapascan, dinnie, in some of the Algonquin dialects inini — in the Maya it is Ninnie. The dress of the native Indians of Yucatan is also peculiar, and seems to have been borrowed from some civilized people who had formerly settled among them, the men wearing sandals and the women a loose garb like a chemise with worked borders, and their hair plaited like the Basque women, all different from the other Indians and even from the Spaniards who came among them. Of the Maya language I trust this Society will place on record some traces more generally useful and accessible than we possess. There is a short Vocabulary of it in Norman's Rambles in Yucatan and another in the French of Waldeck, while the Spaniards have several Grammars of it also, though mostly so rarely to be met with as to be considered un-

attainable. Having then a Vocabulary of some words of other languages to submit to this society to be appended to this Paper, I propose to incorporate with them their equivalents in the Mayan, whereby those who wish it may compare their relative characteristics. Before leaving this part of the subject, I will take the opportunity of referring to the effect which the climate has apparently on the human system in this country. I have already intimated my opinion of the judgment of those writers who dwell on the Varieties of Man as displayed in their complexions, while acknowledging that the differences in their conformations may be somewhat more continuous and permanent. In a paper which I read before this Society in June last I noticed the effect which the climate of North America had on the descendants of Europeans, and added that I could satisfactorily to myself at least observe that this effect extended also to the descendants of Africans in the United States, in the Bahamas, and even in Cuba, of children born of the same parents, I could undertake to say which had been born in Cuba and which in Africa. In Yucatan I observed the same effect on the Creole Spaniards, who were evidently to be distinguished from their European brethren. With them, without any suspicion of mixture of blood, I could observe the figure more lanky, the hair coarser on the head and scantier on the face, the color and skin assuming a parchment hue, and the whole character becoming apathetic, with a drawling accent different from the natives of Spain, which could scarcely have been brought about by the heat of the climate merely, inasmuch as that differed little from the temperature of Spain, but might have arisen from geological causes operating throughout the Continent. There was much more worthy of attention in the character of the people beyond what I have adverted to, which however I reserve for a separate notice, as the object of the present paper is only generally to dwell on the characteristic differences of the various tribes on the New Continent to show their probable respective origins. The next people that are to be found there to attract our attention are the remnants of the Caribs, of whom there are considerable numbers along the whole line of coast from the Belize to the Brazils. The unfortunate practice to which I have before referred, of our selfstyled Ethnographers calling the same people by different names, without any attempt to ascertain their affinities or divergencies, has led to much confusion with respect to these people which might and ought to have been avoided. Humboldt, Hervas, and others of the better class of observers, have shown that what was merely

a suggestion with Robertson and other earlier writers was an Ethnological fact as to the Caribs of English and Spanish writers and the Galibis of the French being essentially the same people. Their vocabularies have been sufficiently given to prove their identity, and in the comparison which I have myself carefully made between the Carib of Le Breton of 1658, and the Galibi of Paul Boyer, Sicur de Petit Puy, published at Paris in 1654, I am enabled positively to say that they were a kindred people at that date though the two writers now mentioned, writing so contemporaneously as 1654 and 1658 did not seem to be aware of the fact. With reference to this people, the Caribs, the idea was suggested to my mind from my own observation, that they were originally an African people who had been driven or drifted across the Atlantic, and that before I had referred to Bryan Edward's work on Jamaica, in which I then found he had expressed the same conviction from their personal appearance and peculiar manners. In the print he has given of a Carib family which is a faithful representation of the people, any reader may observe the strong traits of resemblance. In the paper I read before this Society on the 14th March 1854 I endeavoured to support this opinion by various arguments and especially by a comparison of some primary words of the Carib language with their equivalents in the language of Western Africa. I have little now to add to those arguments, but every further consideration I have been able to give to the subject, has only tended to strengthen my conviction. Two questions have been suggested in reply to them. First whether the analogies might not have arisen from some admixture of runaway slaves associating themselves with the Caribs, and secondly whether any small vessels, such as savage tribes in Africa could at best be supposed to have possessed, would have been able to survive a voyage across the Atlantic. In reply to the first doubt I gave an answer by anticipation that the Carib Dictionary of Le Breton had been published in 1658, at which period few negro slaves had as yet been brought over to the plantations, so that the few runaways that might have escaped to them could not be considered sufficient in number or consequence to have affected the language of the aborigines. To this I have further to add that when they were brought over in greater numbers, it was soon found that very unfriendly feelings were shown against them by the Caribs, who were readily induced by the planters to assist them in capturing the runaway negroes for very paltry rewards. Consequently no considerable admixture could be

supposed to have taken place between them, and although, according to my theory the Caribs, had been originally of the same race, yet still in the course of the 200 years that must have elapsed since their migration, and their mingling with the people they found in the New World before them, they had formed new combinations to obliterate all former affinities. As to the second question of the improbability of any savage nation being able to make such a passage I think we need feel as little difficulty. People accustomed to the hardships of savage life could endure the privations consequent on such a voyage at least as well as civilized men, and how such have endured them we have unfortunately abundant instances. I need only recall to your recollections one which will be familiar to you all, of Captain Bligh and his companions who were set adrift on the Ocean by the mutineers of the "Bounty," though many other such instances might be easily adduced. In that one the Commander with 18 others in the Ship's launch ran by the log a distance of 3618 nautical miles, a voyaye of 47 days, with the gunwale almost to the water's edge, with scarcely anything to support life, without shelter from the weather, yet without the loss of a single man. This distance of 3618 miles is double that from Africa to the West India Islands and the time of 47 days is also double of that which would be sufficient for a boat to run before the wind from Africa across the Ocean. But even if they were afloat so long a time we may consider that savages in such a case would not scruple to feed on the bodies of their fellows, as civilized men have been too often tempted to do, especially when on shore those savages might have before given way to such horrible emergencies, as both in Africa and America we have accounts of their practices as well as elsewhere. The earlier writers speaking of the people in the New World found more especially addicted to such propensities, designated them Caribs as a name applied to them by the other inhabitants signifying superiority over them. Peter Martyr says, the word in the language of all these countries signified "stronger than the rest;" Vesputius says, it was a word of their own language signifying men of great wisdom. Se eorum lingua Charaibi, hoc est magnæ sapientiæ viros vocantes, et provincia ipsa Parias ab ipsis nuncupata est. Grynæus p. 166. Without taking this as the literal meaning of the name, I think we may from this consider that it was an appellation they even then gave themselves as they have continued to do ever since, which appellation the other Indians took from them as a word of dreaded import. If then it may be con-

sidered a national term they applied to themselves, and if they may be supposed traceable to Africa, this name may be connected with that of the people still known on that Continent as Karabas, the Efik tribe on the old Calabar and cross rivers. I suspect the name of the river Calabar itself is connected with theirs, the letters l and r being so commonly convertible. The Efik tribe with their ramifications are widely extended over the neighbouring districts, with the Mokos inland and the Ibas on the Delta of the Niger to Yoruba, Igarra, Apa and Itu. "Human sacrifices, slavery and cruel superstitions are said fearfully to prevail among them" and "very many of the tribes are yet there addicted to the practice of Cannibalism," Clarke's Specimens of Dialects. p. 86. In Cuba they are known as Carabalis, and are looked on by the other negro slaves with dislike on account of this propensity alleged against them. It is with the language also of this same people that in my former Paper I compared the Carib words given by Rochefort and Le Breton, showing a connection from that almost certain criterion of the relationship that existed between them, and confirmed by the national appellations and characters. It may prove true that the languages of Africa and that of the Caribs, as given by Le Breton, may have been very dissimilar. But the Vocabularies show the words of primary necessary use to have been almost identical, and this is evidence of a commixture at least, which is all that I contended for. Such words will cling tenaciously to the memory of the adult savage, even though he may have forgotten the verbal conformations of his mother tongue among people speaking a different language. Nay such verbal conformations I have no hesitation in saying may in certain circumstances be adopted as to alter materially the original language, and the Caribs in the West Indies driven or drifted over from Africa might thus have spoken a language in 1650 modified accordingly from what they brought over 200 years previously. Let us always bear in mind that in the present state of Ethnology we are only collectors for our successors, who from our labors may verify as facts what we can only put forward as conjectures. With this consideration as our guide I propose to give as another Appendix to this paper a condensed translation of the Carib Grammar of Le Breton compiled 200 years since, which is now so rare, as to command an exorbitant price, to be compared by those who feel an interest in the question with the modern languages of Africa, and also with that of the modern Caribs about to be published by this Society from the labors of my va-

lued friend the Reverend A. Henderson of Belize. It will no doubt be found to present many variances, as might be expected from the known history of the people in later times, when we find them represented as having a language spoken by the men entirely different from that spoken by the women. This was clearly occasioned by their being a different people, a body of men driven away perhaps by a stronger faction or tribe from their own homes, who had fallen upon a weaker people killing and devouring the males, and using the females as slaves. The progeny of this combination must sooner or later as in all similar cases have grown up with a mixed language, and the frequency of this occurrence should be a warning to us not to attach too great an importance to the comparison of vocabularies merely as an identification of languages. It might happen in future ages, that when Macaulay's New Zealander comes to moralize over the ruins of London, he would compare some compendious Vocabularies of the English and French languages together, and finding some hundreds of words in them identical, jump at once to the conclusion, as some modern writers would do, that the languages were identical, and that England was only a province of France. This is only what we find certain selfimagined Ethnologists are doing, and therefore it is essentially necessary for us to be on our guard against a judgment so fallacious. Languages as I have already observed may arise from a variety of origins, and new languages may be invented as we learn from the Missionaries that children of certain savage tribes being left by their elders alone, while out on their hunting or predatory excursions, sometimes grow up with a language unintelligible to their parents. Language is so much an inherent characteristic of man that we may feel convinced of this fact as a natural contingency. If a number of children were gathered together, as in ancient times by the Egyptian monarch, and allowed to grow up together under circumstances, as under the charge of dumb keepers, so that they should hear no word whatever spoken, we may fully expect they would invent a language for themselves, perhaps as expressive as any existing. But where two languages are mixed together, we may expect to find them in their union both fuller and more forcible. The Carib language is thus said to have been remarkable for its fulness and force, although it is at the present day and always has been deficient in expressions suited to the exigencies of civilized life. From the earliest period that we hear of them, we find them carrying on their cannibal practices on the most systematic method. Amerigo

Vespucci relates that he fell in with a party of Caribs out on one of their marauding expeditions who fled at his approach, leaving their boat to the whites, in the bottom of which were three young men captives who were soon to have served as a repast for their conquerors. Even in 1658 Rochefort writes with complacency, that the Caribs declared they found the French very good eating, the Spaniards not so delectable, but the English perfectly indigestible. The natives of the islands whose women they had taken after devouring the men seem to have been to their particular appetite. Those natives I consider to have been of the people still known as Arrawaks, the original inhabitants of the West India islands, yet found in very considerable numbers in the Guianas. To account for the original habitations of the Caribs, Rochefort had given various traditions, one to which he seemed himself to lean, was that they had come from the mainland, where numbers of their own nation were then as now to be found. But the conclusive answer to this was his own statement that on the Continent they spoke a language similar to that of the women of the islands, which was entirely distinct from the language spoken by the Caribs in the islands. If these Caribs had come from the mainland how could they have forgotten the language spoken on the mainland to adopt another? If they came from elsewhere, as from Africa, they might be expected to have brought another language with them, which language they might keep, though it had been lost by those of their people who settled on the mainland, in the course of the 200 years that had elapsed between their coming there and when Rochefort wrote. This then seems a conclusive answer to their having come from the mainland. Another account Rochefort took from an Englishman named Brigstock, of whom he writes in terms of the highest eulogium, to the effect that they had been driven from Florida by a people whom he calls the Apalachians. This account has been taken up by various other writers down to Washington Irving, but as it appears to me very unadvisedly. The Caribs were not found in the Northern but in the Southern islands of the Western Indian seas, and they were found with different practices and characteristics than the Indians of North America. I do not doubt the correctness of the tradition repeated from Brigstock, that in consequence of disagreements among themselves, some parties of Indians had been at some anterior time driven away by those whom he calls Apalachians, but only dispute the conclusion that these exiles were the progenitors of the Caribs. Every consideration shows

that these Caribs were not a people connected in any manner by language, habits, character, or personal appearance, with the Indians of North America. On the contrary they exhibited, as I have already shown, every affinity with Africans. Peter Martyr and Fernando Columbus both speak of the savage tribes on the eastern coasts, eaters of human flesh, as being negroes, dark as Africans, and very different, according to their description, from the aboriginals of North America. They were certainly an intrusive people, conquerors of some previous people, having slain the males and enslaved the females, who we find spoke a different language from the men for a subsequent period of at least 250 years.

The next question then is, who were those former inhabitants of the country, and to this we have a reply suggested by one of the traditions handed down by Rochefort, which can be in its deductions reduced to a certainty. Rochefort says that the greatest enemies of the Caribs were the people then as yet known as the Arrawaks, whose principal place of habitation then as yet was in the Guianas. These Arrawaks were at first masters of the Caribs, probably referring to the first comers among them; but when these from new accessions or otherwise became conscious of their strength, they "utterly destroyed that nation, excepting only the women, whom they took to themselves, and by that means repeopled the islands, whence it came that the wives of the Caribs of the islands have a language different from that of the men in many things and in some consonant to that of the Arrawaks of the Continent." The Arrawaks were then, as they are yet, a more peaceable people than the Caribs, the Caribs being, as I said before, an intrusive people, and the Arrawaks the original inhabitants not only of the Carib islands, Guiana and the neighbouring districts, but also of the larger islands Hayti and Cuba, and probably of the Bahamas. In my former paper I stated that there were to be found in Hakluyt 57 words of the language spoken in the island of Trinidad collected there in 1595 by Sir Robert Dudley, of which I could only trace a very few to the Carib as given by Rochefort and Le Breton, I judged then that the words in that list, which were not Carib, might have belonged to the language of the females, and turning to the Arrawak as that language have found my conjecture verified. Of the Arrawak language there is not that I am aware of any Grammar or Dictionary published, but the Moravian Missionary Sheulty translated the Acts of the Apostles into it in the year 1802, and Mr. Brett, an English Clergyman now resident there, has published some other portions of the

Scriptures, viz. the Gospels of Matthew and John, which were printed in 1850, and other portions now going through the press. From these I have made a Vocabulary and notes for a Grammar, which it will be unnecessary to continue as possibly Mr. Brett may favor us with a better one than I could put together, as well as a fuller Vocabulary than the time I could give the labor would allow me to do. I will only therefore give as an Appendix the words in Hakluyt, arranged by the side of their equivalents in the Arrawak of 1800 and 1850, the Carib of 1650 and the modern Carib of 1850, and the neighbouring languages of the Mayas and the Musquitos. I will only add that at least 13 of the words in Hakluyt as used in 1595 are identical with the present Arrawak, being those representing the Sun, the moon, fire, water, stone, hair, eye, hand, foot, a rope, a basket, gold, and a sword. The modern Carib I have taken from the Gospel of Saint Matthew translated by Mr. Henderson of Belize and the Vocabulary of the language he is now furnishing to this Society. But I regret to think that we have no record of their language as spoken in Guiana, where I have no doubt it would be less corruptly preserved than in Honduras. In the former country it is much mixed with Arrawak, though the two people still keep themselves very distinct from each other. In Honduras it seems to me to be an extremely corrupt jargon, as indeed we may conclude it must have necessarily become under the circumstances under which the Caribs came there. The great settlement of this people originally was far to the South, and those now in Honduras were brought there under the orders of the British Government towards the end of the last Century. (See Martin's West Indies p. 285.) It was in 1796 that the British Government, finding the Carib Inhabitants of the British West India Islands too intractable for the planters, determined to remove them, and upwards of 5000 of them accordingly were taken to the island of Ruatan then a desert island. From this place they were afterwards, as Mr. Squier politely expresses it in his Notes on Central America, invited to the mainland by the Spanish authorities, who aided them in founding various establishments on the coast in the vicinity of Truxillo. (Squier's Central America p. 212.) Thus the original Carib, mixed up as it was with Arrawak, became still more a jargon in which we now find English, French and Spanish combinations ridiculously confounded. I refer as my authority to Mr. Henderson's translation of Saint Matthew's Gospel into this jargon. These Caribs have increased considerably since their deportation,

and are now an industrious and thriving community having several villages in British Honduras, though more further to the South. A few are still in Ruatan, but the principal population of this beautiful and important island are now British subjects from the Caymans and other British settlements. I may not be considered wandering from my subject by adverting to this island as unquestionably calculated to be the great emporium of commerce for that part of the world, and I trust that the British Government will never be so neglectful of national interests as to waive the claims which from long occupation they possess over it, while the Spanish Government and that which has succeeded it, cannot claim any right, inasmuch as they have never pretended to colonize it, and allege no other right than that of propinquity to their coasts. This right, however, is utterly untenable, for thus Guernsey and Jersey might as well be claimed by France, and Bermuda and the Bahamas by the United States. There are at present at Ruatan about 2000 inhabitants, who have voluntarily asked of the British Government a legislative system, and bound themselves to pay in return a land tax of one shilling per acre. The neighbouring island of Bonacca which is nearly as large as Ruatan, had at the time of my visit in 1857, only one solitary Scotchman resident there with a few Indians in his employ, while cattle ranged wild over the island, free for any one to come and kill them at pleasure, as I understood masters of vessels were frequently in the habit of doing. Traces of ancient civilization abounded in this island, but into the question of that civilization I do not at present enter, leaving it for a future occasion, while my present enquiry refers only to the native tribes found on those coasts. I have already intimated the opinion that those natives before the arrival of the Caribs were Arrawaks, whose language, as now existing in British and Dutch Guiana, I have referred to. The evidences I have to adduce. On comparing the Scripture translations of Mr. Brett of the first and those by the Moravian Missions of the latter, I find only dialectic differences, as the use of the vowel *u* by the one uniformly where the other has *o*. In other respects I find little or no difference. I have already referred to the words in Hakluyt as proving incontestably that this same language was spoken in Trinidad in 1595, and we have another corroboration of this in a word handed down by Sir Walter Raleigh who says that Kairix in the language of that country meant island. This word still remains in Arrawak for island. But beyond that part of the coast we have great reason for believing that Arrawak was the lan

guage of the other islands also, even so far North as the Lucayas from the names still found there which have their natural meaning in Arrawak. Thus Luku, or Loko in Arrawak signifies people, and would be the word applied to themselves by the natives in answer to the enquiries of the Spaniards. Many words of Arrawak also still seem to remain as provincialisms in Cuba, of which I propose to give an appendix, naming only at present bohis for a house, and coco which I understood to be for white, besides several names of places. I fear I am trespassing already too largely on the attention of the Society and will therefore dismiss this part of my subject with only one farther notice of them. I am not aware that I saw any one of the Arrawak tribe; but as I have intimated an opinion that the Mayas were from the South Eastern part of Asia and the Caribs from Africa, I would wish those who feel interested in these enquiries and have the means and the leisure to pursue them, to examine whether there be any affinities of language or otherwise between them and the Australians. I recommend this point for enquiry as Mr. Brett in his work "Indian Missions in Guiana" p. 98 mentions a peculiarity in their marriage institutions which appears to me similar to what we read of among some of the Australians. He says "their tribe exhibits in its customs traces of an organization which was probably much more perfect in former times than it is at present. They are divided into families, each of which has a distinct name as the Siwidi, Karuafudi, Onisidi, &c. Unlike our families, these all descend in the female line, and no individual of either sex is allowed to marry another of the same family name. Thus a woman of the Siwidi family bears the same name as her mother, but neither her father nor her husband can be of that family. Her children and the children of her daughters will also be called Siwidi, but both her sons and daughters are prohibited from an alliance with any individual bearing the same name, though they may marry into the family of their father, if they choose. These customs are strictly observed, and any breach of them would be considered as wicked." As Mr. Brett observes, this custom indicates an earlier organization, and we may suppose an early civilization of which they now possess no other remains. Still they are represented as evincing a greater aptitude for civilized life than other tribes in their neighbourhood and appear to have had higher attainments in that respect when first visited by the Spaniards, as they are described as using bucklers beyond what the others possessed and being more of an agricultural people. I have

it now only left me to speak of the Mosquito Indians, of whom I saw many in the course of my visit, and whom I found in every respect a most interesting people, well worthy of more attention than they have hitherto received. The history of this people has like that of the others been enveloped in much obscurity, but it is the province of our science by all the appliances in her reach, not only to elucidate history where history exists, but also to supply her deficiencies where no history is to be traced. Here then I have to refer you back to the tradition which was repeated to Rochefort by the Englishman Brigstock, of a tribe of people being banished from Florida by those whom he called Apalachians, and which tribe he and other writers down to Sir Richard Schomburgk and Washington Irving, have taken for granted were the Caribs. That some weaker party in a nation might have been driven away from Florida is as probable there, as we know such events to have been of constant occurrence elsewhere in all ages and all countries; but if this tradition were really to be relied on, I should judge that the people driven away from Florida were not the numerous and warlike Caribs who could not be supposed to have been driven away by any nation found in Florida, but some smaller tribe who, though perhaps equally brave, yet were not so numerous, nor so fierce and unyielding. Such might have been the people now known as the Mosquito Indians. I saw a great number of this extremely interesting people, and could not but fancy I saw in them a tribe of North American Indians. They had the same coppery color, the same slight but muscular figure, the same easy selfpossessed manner, the same graceful carriage, the same cast of countenance. They have a language distinct from any in their neighbourhood, confined to the few thousands of their own tribe, which language they have yet kept remarkably pure, though they have been subjected to much intermixture of blood with whites and blacks, with Europeans, Negroes and Caribs. This intermixture however cannot be considered to have affected their race very materially, or we should have found traces in their language of such corruptions as we find in the modern Carib, whereas after careful examination of their Vocabulary I can only find one word borrowed from another language in their neighbourhood, and that is Kati, the Moon, taken from the Arrawak. A Grammar and Vocabulary of this language were compiled by the Reverend A. Henderson of Belize and printed for private use at New York in 1846 which has been reprinted in the 2d Vol. of the transactions of the American Ethnological Society. I trust we may soon have a revised

edition of it from the author, as it appears to me a language deserving of much more attention than it has hitherto obtained. It is simple in its structure and yet elegant in its combinations; and of its primitive character I will give only one instance, in respect to its pronouns, that whereas in all other languages, these vary in the singular and plural, in the Mosquito an additional termination is affixed to the singular as in the case of common nouns, as if we, instead of saying We, Ye, They, should add the plural termination to the Singular and say, Is, Thous, Hes. The same remark may apply to the people, but too great censure cannot be passed on this account on the English Government and nation for having so long and so shamefully neglected them. For 200 years they have exhibited a singular affection to the English nation and proved it by a singular fidelity. They have been faithful though humble adherents in war, and zealous followers in the peaceful pursuits of commerce. They have ceded their lands to us, they have given us their services in peace, they have been at all times ready to receive instruction from us in the arts of life; but we have left them still to roam over their coasts all but naked as they did 200 years ago, without ever sending them, that I know of, a missionary or a schoolmaster to teach them the comforts of civilization or the blessings of Christianity. Mr. Henderson's acquaintaince with them arose in the British possessions of Honduras where numbers of them come annually in search of work, which work they assiduously engage in until they have earned sufficient for their wants. It is then truly ridiculous to see them go off as I have seen them go to the stores at Belize, and supply themselves with a sort of slop shirt, and then a gun and ammunition with which they hurry off to their woods as happy as if they had all their desires gratified. The traders of course profit by them shamefully and usuriously in their bargains, still more so in the sale of liquors to which of course as uncivilized men they are generally lamentably addicted. Thus they may be acknowledged to be what they have been called, a degraded people, but their vices are sins for which the English Government and English nation are accountable, while their many virtues, their confiding kindnes s, their unshaken loyalty and general probity are entirely their own. It is vain for an unassisted individual like myself to endeavour to raise a cry on their behalf, when we know it to be only one of a hundred such cases of neglect on the part of the English Government, but I trust that even these few observations will not have fallen in vain.

In conclusion, these instances will I think be allowed to be conclusive proofs of the assumption with which I proposed to ask your assent to the theory as to the multifarious and heterogeneous character of the American populations, so heterogeneous in fact that we cannot upon due reflection in the slightest degree hesitate in denying the probability of one peculiar origin either of primitive creation or subsequent migration. What is true of one people in their onward progress may be safely predicated of others, and it is thus the peculiar province of Ethnology to trace the different families of mankind in their respective courses, so as to prove the validity of the great and generous doctrine of the unity of the Human Species by which we are all linked together, *ἐξ ἑνος αἱματος παν ἐθνος ἀνθρωπων.*

NOTE.

The Appendices referred to in this Paper were not completed.

HINTS ON THE FORMATION OF A NEW ENGLISH DICTIONARY.

READ BEFORE THE PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

MAY 20. 1858.

In 1857 the Council of the Philological Society called the attention of the Members to the urgent want of a new English Dictionary to be compiled in a more comprehensive manner than those now in use. Almost all the Members and many persons not connected with the Society promised to assist in this undertaking, and several Papers were read containing suggestions for the consideration and guidance of those who took part in the work. The aim of the following Paper was to urge the necessity of ascertaining the real and ultimate derivation of words, as well as their primary signification in English.

In the 5th Vol. of the Philological Society's Proceedings there is an account given of the Etymological Society of Cambridge established there upwards of 40 years since, and in the list of original members it is highly pleasing to my mind to find my name recorded (p. 133) in association with so many of the most eminent scholars of our times. I venture to advert to the circumstance principally to offer it as a warranty, if required, for the assumption of such a task as I have here undertaken. When so much credit is indisputably due to our Lexicographers for the industry, learning and ingenuity they have displayed, it might well be considered a presumption in any one to attempt to pass a judgment on their defects, who had it not in his power to refer to years of attention to the study as entitling him to do so. Though their merits may be acknowledged to be very great, their deficiencies must be acknowledged also, and it is by no means in any disparagement of the former that some of the latter may be pointed out. At the same time whatever may be judged of the extent and character of those defects, we may yet certainly claim for our English Dictionaries a marked superiority over those of any other country. Other civilized nations of modern times have equally recognized the importance of having some standard work in the nature of a Lexicon to refer to, as an authority in respect of their respective languages. But to effect their object they have been obliged to have recourse to the assistance of their Governments, and the co-operation of their learned Societies, and

even these have only partially succeeded. English Dictionaries on the other hand have been all hitherto the result of private enterprize, and the success which has in this respect attended the labors of individuals may be thus justly referred to as an incentive to animate the exertions of a larger number of co-laborers to follow their example and improve on their works. Well then would it more especially become the Philological Society to undertake one of such a character as may be worthy of the nation as well as of the language, of the pre-eminence of our literature, as well as of our social position. The more full and complete a Dictionary may be made, the more justly may it be said to answer those requirements, and if a Lexicon totius Anglicitatis could be reasonably hoped for, it would be a work of stupendous industry and the highest literary importance. But if it can be hoped for as practicable, the labors of many must be wisely directed and steadily maintained on a well understood basis of co-operation, so that different tasks should be assigned to those engaged on it according to their several qualifications. Individuals can scarcely be expected to possess or supply all the knowledge and means requisite to make such a work so complete as to be a recognized authority, free from many substantial objections; and therefore to prepare one deserving of general acceptance and approval as a national standard in matters of language, is an undertaking specially becoming a learned and numerous Society combining the energy of private enterprize with the character of a public authority.

But such a Dictionary should be not merely a Vocabulary, as most have been hitherto. It should be also a full history as far as ascertainable of each word, whereby to unravel its ramifications and explain its meanings. This cannot be done without the help of Etymology. Without Etymology you can only dwell on the surface of words, and though our Lexicographers have acknowledged this necessity by entering into such enquiries, they have left it to us to observe defects to be corrected, and deficiencies to be supplied, if we would improve upon their labors. These defects and deficiencies run so closely into one another, that they can scarcely perhaps be separately distinguished, and may be generally included under the category of a want of sufficient discrimination and judgment, as well as of extended and accurate information. But though so intimately blended together as to be somewhat difficult to be dilated upon severally, I think it will not be difficult for me to convey my meaning by a few examples.

1. The first objection I have to refer to is one which does not require to be dwelt upon at any length, as the instances are too many and too wellknown to be unnecessarily detailed. In fact they arise even unsought for and are forced upon us in the midst of other questions, I mean those where Etymologies are given so palpably idle and fatuitous as positively to justify the sneers cast on Etymology by some who ridicule it altogether.

2. Of the same character in kind though in another direction are those errors of judgment where etymologies are given from sources with which the words could have no possible connection, and so giving the wildest conjectures in the place of authority. Some writers if they can but hit on some Greek or Latin word having some possible affinity to the one they know not how to derive otherwise, seize on it as if desirous of at least showing their learning and thus become ridiculous by the show of erudition. Many other examples may be suggested, but I offer the few following.

Cannibal, a word first heard of upon the discovery of the New World is given by the earliest writers of that event as an Indian word, the name of a savage people found there. The first writer who uses it, is I believe Peter Martyr of Angleria, who died in 1526 and who wrote as he states from information given him by Columbus himself and others who had been engaged in the first discoveries of America. His Decades have been several times printed, and first in England by Hakluyt, and translated into English by Mr. Lok who had been an associate with Hakluyt in his great work, distinct from this publication. In his first decade, P. Martyr speaks of the savage race found in the Caribbee Islands as "the wilde and mischievous people called Canibales or Caribes, which were accustomed to eate man's flesh and called of the olde writers Anthropophagi." And in like manner throughout his interesting and circumstantial narrative he couples the words Cannibals and Caribs together as synonymous; as in the 7th decade ch. 4 "the Caniballes otherwise called Caribes are men eaters." The next earliest writer I conceive to be Americus Vesputius whose original account we have transcribed into the collection published by Grynæus, Basil. 1537, and he speaks p. 170 of the savages as gens hæc tam effera et crudelis, humanarum carnium comestrix Canibali nuncuparetur. In the same collection, in the account given of Columbus and his discoveries the same people are referred to not as Caribs, but only as Cannibals. Canibalos appellant ferinos populos, qui in cibatu homines habeant gratissimos. p. 92., the word Carib never being used.

This word Cannibal therefore being clearly the Indian name of the people afterwards better known as Caribs, how ridiculous it is to suggest for it a derivation from the Latin, as if the Indians had known Latin, and taken their names from that language. Yet in one of our Dictionaries the derivation suggested is from caro, carnis, and both in Todd's Johnson and Richardson we have it suggested as from Canis a dog. Richardson says "perhaps a canine appetite from Lat. Canis a dog," but adds more sensibly "though by some suspected to be a corruption of Caribal from Caribes the name of the people among whom Cannibalism was (Hakluyt learned) practised. This word (he goes on to say) is not in our older Lexicographers though used by so early a writer as Hakluyt (Voyages, Vol. 3. p. 576.) "The Caribes I learned to be men eaters or canibals, and great enemies of the islanders of Trinidad." (Voyage of Sir R. Dudley, who returned to England in 1595.) The suggestion of the word being a corruption of the name Caribe, or rather a varied pronunciation, is I consider the correct definition, judging that the natives of the different West India islands from whom the Spaniards received it had pronounced it sometimes one way and sometimes the other. Peter Martyr as before observed uses the two words conjointly, and I think the explanation may be made thus; Caribe was the true name which they themselves recognized, but the other natives with whom the Spaniards came first in contact were of the Maya race, inhabitants of Yucatan and the islands between that peninsula and Cuba, and perhaps that island also. P. Martyr says they spoke the same language, and if that language were the same as the Maya now spoken in Yucatan, then I am enabled to say there can be no doubt of the correctness of the supposition. The Mayas of the present day have not the letter R in their language, any more than the Chinese with whom the Mayas seem to have a great affinity in language, manners, and personal characteristics. They could not therefore pronounce the word Caribe, but would pronounce it probably Canibali, and so have delivered it to the Spaniards. As I have no authority to quote for this description of the Maya language and people, I must state it on my own, having been myself among them in Yucatan, and having begun to learn the language previously to going there from a native of that peninsula in Havana.

Canoe is another Indian word we have adopted, and as such it ought to have been noted in our Dictionaries. P. Martyr, whom I prefer quoting as two translations of his Decades have been published in England, says "as soone as

they hadde broken the Canibal's boats or lighters which they call Canoas they loosed their ankers &c." and again "they shewed much humanitie to our men and helped them with their lighters or small boats which they call Canoas." Those Canoas are described by him and also by Columbus and other authorities as holding from 40 to 50 men, though made of only one tree hollowed out, and it is worthy of note that Canoa seems to be an African as well as a native American word, and is one of the many proofs that may be adduced of African tribes, especially the Caribs, having found their way over to the New World. Of this word Canoe or Canoa in Todd there is no derivation suggested — but Richardson thinks it has the same origin as Can a drinking vessel, quoting Menage who derives it from the Greek *καννα* a reed, and the Greek from the Hebrew and other Eastern languages, and particularly refers to Pliny who, he says, records of the Indian reeds or canes that they be of such a length that between every joint they will yield sufficient to make boats able to receive three men a piece to row at their ease. Another word under this category I would mention is 'Carminative' applied to certain medicines of a soothing nature, especially such as are given to children, and applied of old, as old nurses still apply them, with singing. Such a simple explanation of the word however is not suited to the learned taste of our lexicographers, and they choose to take the word carmen in its recondite sense — supposed to be so called as having *vim carminis*, the power of a charm, says Todd — or as Richardson says from Latin carminare to cleanse from gross parts or from Carmen as if acting by charm or enchantment. The only other word I will adduce is Chronicle — here the Greek *χρονος* is too palpable not to be seized upon, and supposed to be used as if the old writers had a notion of the modern *'Times'* uppermost in their minds, when in fact they had little or no knowledge of Greek at all, and if they had, would never have thought of the refinement of twisting it into Chronicle. In the oldest use of the word we find it invariably without the letter H and in the varied spellings of the word I think we may clearly see it was taken not from the Greek but from the Latin Coronica, as the Records of the Monarchies were styled in the middle ages.

Among the mistakes in our Dictionaries I would class not only the positively wrong explication but also any given in too restricted a sense, as for instance to calve is given "to bring forth a calf, spoken of a cow", when it might be added, and of some other animals, especially sea mammalia. 'To rut'

is applied only to copulation of deer, when in the same manner it should be said, and of some other animals. Of instances of the former sort I mention two words Pourprise or Purprise and Gambrel. — The former word though of very frequent use in our older writers, is not given by Richardson, and in Todd's Johnson it is explained as a close or inclosure, a very restricted meaning when in fact the word is of a very large and comprehensive signification. It is true he also adds "the whole compass of a manour", but there again it seems restricted to a manour, when the real sense of the word is the whole compass of any building as well as any larger locality. Such is the evident meaning in the quotation given by Todd from Bacon's Essays. "The place of justice is hallowed, and therefore not only the Bench, but the foot pace and precincts and purprise ought to be preserved without corruption." Holland in his translation of Pliny speaking of an artificial mound says "it carrieth a pourprise or precinct of 3 miles compasse" (p. 139,) and in another part he speaks of the pourprise of the heavens, by which words he translates the Latin circumflexus. Du Cange has, Pourprisia Locus sepibus, muris aut vallis conclusus, and this our Lexicographers seem to translate a Close or Inclosure — but that this is not the meaning is not only clear from the above but also from Du Cange's definition of the verb pourprendre pro entourer, environner, ambire, cingere. The word Gambrel is explained by Todd as the leg of a horse, deriving it from the Italian Gamba, gambarella, which is also a Spanish word, and no doubt the same as the French Jambe. Todd quotes from Grew "the weight which the tendon lying on a horse's gambrel, doth then command when he rears up with a man upon his back." This does not support Todd's explanation and in fact the Gambrel is not the leg, but only part of the leg, and is not to be restricted to horses only. Holland in his translation of Pliny applies it to the Ox. Thus in B. 8. c. 45 p. 225, "In chusing of calves to sacrifice with, those are allowed for good and sufficient whose taile commeth downe to the joint of the haugh or gambrel." Richardson explains Gambrill as the hind leg of a horse and this, if the preceding remarks are just, is equally incorrect. Though our Lexicographers ignore too often the Spanish in favor of Italian words for their derivations, I believe it may be found in general that words common to both those languages have been introduced here from Spain; and referring to the Spanish, the word Gamba is seldom used by writers, and in common parlance only as Guarda la Gamba, as

boys among us would say take care of your shins. But the great deficiency that seems to me to exist in our Dictionaries is the neglect of searching into the languages of people around us for the derivation of many words which might thus have been properly explained, whereas for want of this knowledge or consideration they have had recourse to wild speculations and surmises equally wrong and ridiculous. Wherever they could find a pretext for a derivation from the Greek or Latin, it has of course been seized on as irrefragable. French in like manner and Italian has been a favourite, while what they call the Anglo-Saxon has been a trump or triumph card, carrying off every thing beyond contention. What however was the Anglo-Saxon but a mixture of the barbarous German then spoken by the rovers of the Continent with the Celtic dialects existing at the time in these islands, and hence it seems to me that the Lexicographers have not paid sufficient attention to the great and surprisingly great Celtic element in our language, in merging it too much in the Anglo-Saxon. Thus if we find in the Anglo-Saxon many, I may say hundreds of words which are not to be found in any other Teutonic dialect, but which are of the same import in the Cymric or Gaelic, then the inference seems clear that they were taken from the Celtic and ought to be so acknowledged. Among these may be included many of the commonest of modern English household words and even of almost all the articles of dress. It is true many of these are claimed as German, but it is only on the same principle of assumption above adverted to of giving some fanciful derivation at a venture, which for want of a better may be allowed to pass until at length it is received as indubitable. The words I refer to are such as hat, coat, glove, trousers, boots, gown, and perhaps some others. Gown is certainly stated as Welsh and Erse gwn, but hat is derived from the Saxon, and glove and others from the French by forced significations when they could have been directly traced to the Celtic. Thus glove is literally for the hand, as the Welsh now say amlaw, using the adverb *am* for where in the other dialect it is *go*. In like manner hat is connected with hutten to hut, as if the hat were a hut for the head, whereas the proper German word is shoe. This word I acknowledge to be German in all its ramifications — and thus they have handshoe for a glove, fingershoe for a thimble and headshoe for a hat. But the English word pronounced originally het as the Welsh do, is the Welsh word for a covering. The verb hatrer signifies to cover and the word het is any covering, a garland for

instance, as well as a man's or woman's hat for the head. Another word I wish to notice is the termination ton or town, affixed to so many of our names of places. The word in this sense is not to be found in any other Teutonic dialect but the Anglo-Saxon, and the nearest approach to it is the old northern tun signifying area septa, and the Dutch tuin, sæpes, septum, hortus, the old High German Zun sæpes, the Gothic tains, ramus, virga, Anglo-Saxon tan the same, and the Low Dutch teen the same. But in Anglo-Saxon tun never signifies a fence, and appears to me only a corruption of the Celtic dun a hill inhabited. The word still remains generally as the Downs all over England, and in combination with so many names of places, though in others corrupted to ton. Thus we have London, Maldon, Abingdon, Huntingdon, Swindon, Bleadon, Clevedon, Weldon; and in the immediate neighbourhood we have Assendon, Bovingdon, Checkendon, Croydon, Coulsdon, Hambledon, Hendon, Hillingdon, Hoddesdon, Horndon, Hunsdon, Quendon, Roydon, Waddesdon, Wimbledon. Many places are written variously don or ton, and many now ending in ton were originally written don — thus Islington was Yseldon.

Much however as the Lexicographers have passed over of the Celtic, there is another language of a people near us that they have entirely ignored. I refer to the Basques, of whom it has been well observed that our writers seem to know less than they do of our Antipodes. And yet I do not hesitate to say that this people not only for themselves and their language are deserving of the utmost attention from us, but also on account of the important influence they seem to have had somehow or other over the English as well as over the French and even Italian languages, and in a slighter degree over the Spanish. Often have I heard Spaniards speaking of words common to Bascayan and Spanish, say with that self complacency characteristic of the nation, that the Basques had borrowed them from the Spanish, whereas Philology, if they had known of it, would teach them that, if they had words not derived from the Latin, Arabic, Celtic, or Teutonic languages, but common to them with the Basques, then they must have been the borrowers themselves. In like manner, if we find, as we do many words in Italian which are not Latin, Celtic or Teutonic, but Basque, there must have been some ancient connection which it well becomes the scholar to investigate. And again if we find in the Latin many words which are neither Greek, nor Celtic, nor of any other known language, then we must repeat the

observation that it well becomes the scholar to investigate their origin. In the same manner in English very many words seem to me to come under this category. Before, however, I advert to them, I will call your attention to another word which has puzzled our Etymologists exceedingly, the word Hurricane. Dean Trench has justly scouted the derivation as a specimen of the absurd ones, to which I referred in the beginning of this Paper, as bringing discredit on Etymology itself, that of its hurrying the canes off the field, and in his English Past and Present p. 13, seems though doubtingly to assent to its having been "derived from the Caribbean islanders." Todd and Richardson have the French Ouragan and the Spanish Huracan, the former adding the Su. Gothic hurra, to move rapidly or violently, as the original, while the latter says it is "a word which the French Etymologists suppose to have been picked up by the Voyagers to the West Indies and signifying in the language of the Islanders the four winds blowing at the same time the one against the other." And he refers to the quotation from Dampier, which is in these words, "I shall speak next of hurricanes, these are violent storms raging chiefly among the Carribbee islands &c." It is well Richardson does not name the French Etymologist who writes so strangely about "the four winds blowing at the same time the one against the other." I have been witness of several hurricanes of which I shall speak immediately, and I never witnessed or heard of such a thing. But to go to the derivation of the word — Ouragan has no meaning in French nor Huracan in Spanish. But in Basque, and here I come again to the line of my argument, it has a meaning, 'Urac' waters and 'an' a common termination, being for the adverb 'in' or 'there,' and giving the word Uracan a signification of a collection of waters. Here then we come to a very important question in our inquiries, the history and original meaning of words, and we find this word to have very much changed its original meaning. Neither Todd nor Richardson seem to have been aware of it, having overlooked the passage in the Tempest, in which it is expressly stated,

> The watery spout which sailors hurricanoes call.

In Lear the same meaning is implied

> Blow winds and crack your cheeks
> Your cataracts and hurricanoes spout,

And in Drayton's Moon Calf are the following lines

> And down the shower impetuously doth fall
> Like that which men the hurricano call

As the grand deluge had been come again
And all the world should perish by the rain.

Todd also gives from Sir T. Hubert's travels "we believed a herocane was begun, a vast or unwonted tumor in the air." This then I conceive to have been the original meaning of the word, not derived from the Carribbean islanders or West India islands at all, but signifying a violent storm accompanied by an extraordinary fall of water. As I said before I have been witness of several hurricanes, and I can especially refer to one in 1844 and another in 1846. — In the former hurricane at Havana there were 2,546 houses entirely thrown down and double the number injured. In the latter of 1846 of the houses that had been spared by the former or had been newly rebuilt there were 1,872 thrown down and 5,051 injured; among which were included the Government House, the Cathedral, all the Churches but one, one being quite thrown down, the Principal Theatre, the College of San Carlos, and one of the City Gates. 53 vessels were sunk in the harbor, of which one was a French Corvette of war, 3 Spanish vessels of war, and 3 Steamers. 55 vessels were driven ashore or much injured, including the French Admiral's ship driven ashore and the Steamer Tonnerre dismasted, and 10 Spanish vessels of war much damaged. I mention these circumstances to give an idea of the violence of the gale, and yet I should say that it was not the wind that was so remarkable a characteristic of it, as the water thrown upon us not like rain, but in sheets spouting cataracts — the air seemed altogether charged with water and above all it was salt water. The hurricane of 1844 was more widely extended over the island, and though it did much damage to the crop of that year yet the salt water killed the insects that were injurious to the cane and benefited the land otherwise so much that in the following year the canes sprung up more vigorously than before. I trust this will suffice to show that my derivation therefore is not so fanciful as it might at first appear. The Basques are the best sailors of Spain, and it was from them that many nautical words and phrases would thus be extended over Spain and Europe. I may claim the privilege of adding them hereafter. At present I content myself with naming a few chiefly relating to trade which the English language appears to me to have derived from them. To sell and sale are derived both in Todd and Richardson from the Gothic saljan, Saxon syllan, dare, tradere; the former adds Icelandic selia, transmittere, vendere, this appears to me a forced or

constructive meaning to serve for the Etymology. In Basque Sal has exactly this meaning, 'Sell that thou hast' 'Sal zaitzue ditut zuenac.' To carry, Carrayatcea, Carga, Cargo a load or burden, Silver, Sillara (compare siller) Jar, Chara, taste, dastatcea, scarce, escasia, il, to kill, pitcharra, a pitcher, pota, a pot, zauria, sore, nastia, nasty, and many words which the Lexicographers derive from the Italian: and others, — trade, truck, barter, market, which I propose to extend with comparisons with other languages.

The deduction I have to make from these observations is that in carrying out the project of a Dictionary worthy of our times, we should give the history if possible of every word, and that for this purpose we should obtain the assistance of persons well acquainted with all the languages that can be supposed to have had any connexion with the English — to give their views and versions of the derivations of each word and let them be subjected to a general and well considered revision. — And beyond this one only further suggestion, namely, that to every word the Latin equivalent in each sense should be added.

QUESTION OF THE SUPPOSED LOST TRIBES OF ISRAEL.

READ BEFORE

THE BRITISH ASSOCIATION, AT LIVERPOOL,

SEPT. 26, 1854.

TO WHICH ARE ADDED

TWO APPENDICES,

I. — ON THE SIX DAYS OF THE CREATION.

II. — ON THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE WORLD.

In tracing the history of knowledge, it is astonishing to observe how many questions have been and continue to be generally accepted as indubitable truths, which reason and authority show to be groundless errors. On every side we find such errors prevailing; always much to be deplored as impeding the course of learning, but most so when from any cause they become mixed up with considerations entitled to our reverence, which appear to invest them with the same sacred character. To dispel such errors, or to establish a non-recognized truth, may be justly pronounced the most worthy tasks to be undertaken by those who aspire to become the advancers of general instruction. But this great object seems to be lost sight of by the larger portion of modern writers, who are too apt to be only constantly reproducing the lucubrations of their predecessors, or at best to be only stringing together a number of truisms, or it may be even of facts, without ever realizing a new idea, or deducing from them an original conclusion. Thus it is that we find so many fallacies prevailing, which being handed down from one writer to another, are accepted without examination and repeated without any doubt of their trustworthiness, notwithstanding that there is in reality no foundation whatever for the theories formed respecting them.

In the history of the creation given us in the sacred Scriptures, because the word in the Hebrew, יום, *yom*, has unfortunately been translated 'day' in our version, instead of by some term equivalent to 'age' or 'period,' the generality of readers have become imbued with an almost ineradicable impression that the statements of the Mosaic history are contradictory to the discoveries of modern science. Though the same word is constantly used throughout other parts of the Scriptures for other or indefinite periods of time, and is so acknowledged to be by every writer on the subject worthy of notice, yet a prejudice has grown up to the contrary, on the assumption of this reading, of a nature to make even some of those writers to succumb to it, and thereupon to endeavour to reconcile facts with what is opposed both to the original history and to probability itself, by suppositions equally untenable.

Again, in the computation of the chronology of the world, or rather of the period of time that has elapsed since the creation of man, we find the system adopted in our common version of the Scriptures, repeated in every new edition of them, and referred to by writers generally as if it were incontrovertible, notwithstanding the labours of Dr. Hales and Bishop Russell especially, as well as of others, who have so satisfactorily refuted it, and shown how contrary it is to true history and to every conclusion of reason founded upon history.

It must be acknowledged, however, that there was at least some show of authority for these two prepossessions having taken such deep root in general belief. Unaided by the light of later science and modern researches, it was excusable for all the translators of the Scriptures, from those of the Septuagint downwards, to render the word יום by its primary meaning of 'day' in the history of the creation, though in many other parts they could not fail to understand it as bearing a larger signification. There was less excuse for the error relating to the chronology of the world, inasmuch as the Roman Catholic Church had rightly handed down from antiquity a more correct computation, in many particulars, which the mistaken zeal of our Reformers unfortunately repudiated; though even in their behalf it may be urged that their computation had the sanction of the Hebrew reading. But for another illusion as commonly received as either of these, without any reason or authority in its favour, and to which I am not aware of any direct answer having been given, namely the supposed loss of the Ten Tribes of Israel, consequent upon their subjugation by the Assyrians, I now venture to request your attention.

The variety of theories which have been promulgated on the supposition of the loss of those ten tribes, and the numerous works which have been published on the subject, and continue to be published even up to the present time, show how great has been the interest felt regarding their fate, such as to warrant a fuller consideration of it than has been hitherto given; while in the diversity of opinions held respecting it, we cannot but perceive the advisability of passing by all those opinions as mere assumptions, and of endeavouring to ascertain at their original sources the elucidation of their true history.

Shortly after the commencement of our æra, it seems to have already become a prevalent opinion that the ten tribes of Israel, which had separated from their brethren under Jeroboam, and had subsequently been subjugated by the Assyrians, had all been swept away from their lands and taken by their conquerors into Assyria and Media, where their descendants were then still remaining. Josephus, who is considered to have written his work on the ancient history of the Jews about the year 93 of our æra, says, in his eleventh book, with reference to the return from captivity of those who came back with Ezra, "The entire body of the people of Israel remained in that country, wherefore there are but two tribes in Asia and Europe subject to the Romans, while the ten tribes are beyond the Euphrates till now, and are an immense multitude, not to be estimated by numbers." To the same effect St. Jerome in the fifth century, in his notes upon Hosea, says, "Unto this day the ten tribes are subject to the kings of the Parthians, nor has their captivity ever been loosed." And again he says, "The ten tribes inhabit at this day the cities and mountains of the Medes." It is the purpose of our argument to show that these writers were mistaken in their suppositions respecting these tribes, whatever might be the general value to be attached to their authority; but at present it will be sufficient to refer to them, as proving that in the early periods of our æra, they were considered to be still remaining in the land of their captivity. Later writers, however, and especially those of the Jewish race, not contented with this tradition, have been pleased to indulge in more fanciful dreams of those tribes having, at some anterior but undefined period, gone away from their captivity into some distant country, whence they declared they were to emerge at some future period, at the advent of their still-expected Messiah, and return with him triumphantly to the land of their fathers. This rabbinical fancy might have slumbered unnoticed, with so many

others of the same character in their writings, had it not received an extraordinary occasion for its revival on the discovery of America by Columbus. At this time, when public attention began to be attracted to the inhabitants of the New World, among other theories to account for their origin, one was started by a Jewish writer, in conformity with this rabbinical tradition, that they were the descendants of the ten lost tribes who had gone away from their captivity into a distant country. The authority for this tradition was assumed to have been sufficiently decided from a passage in the 13th chapter of the first book of Esdras, upon which foundation accordingly volumes have been written, attempting to show that the American Indians were the descendants of those tribes. The elaborate and costly work of Lord Kingsborough had for its groundwork the attempt to show that those tribes had found their way to Mexico and Central America, though by what means it was left unexplained, while Adair and others have exercised equal ingenuity in claiming the honour of such a descent for the rude hunters of North America. William Penn fancied he could trace Jewish features and other characteristics in the Indians with whom he conversed; and others, even to our day, persist in the same persuasion of their being of Israelitish descent. But the utmost they can bring forward in favour of their ideas, are some trivial resemblances only, which are common to mankind generally, without being able to show any real coincidences whatever of any peculiar nature between those nations of America and the Israelites, in language, civil or religious institutions, social habits, or physical characteristics; while in all these particulars abundant evidences may be adduced of their affinity to other nations of the globe, from whom therefore their origin may more justly be traced.

By the side of this fantasy, another scarcely less ill-founded has been suggested, that the people known to us as Afghans are the representatives of the ten tribes; and this theory has been received with a degree of favour, which entitles it, if on that ground alone, to our consideration. The first who suggested it seems to have been Sir William Jones; and the fact of so distinguished a scholar having indulged in such a supposition as that the ten tribes had really gone away from the land of their captivity into some unknown region, on the authority of the book of Esdras, is a proof of how great has been the credence given to this tradition, and how much it requires a detailed confutation. Since his day, numerous other writers have adopted the same theory for the descent of the Afghans; Sir George Rose

having advocated it within the last two years in a pamphlet which has been lauded in the 'Quarterly Review,' and enlarged upon in another work by the Rev. C. Forster, so as to give it a support which forbids our passing it over cursorily.

The arguments advanced by these writers in favour of their views are founded on the traditions of the Afghans, on their Jewish physiognomy, and a fancied resemblance of names among them to those of the ancient Israelites. But the Jewish physiognomy and Jewish names are common all over the East, among the Arabs and other cognate nations, and among Mahommedan as well as among many Christian tribes and professed Jews, so that no satisfactory conclusion can be admitted on such grounds. It may be undoubtedly true that some tribe or family may be found among the Afghans calling themselves by the name of Joseph, or of one similar to that of Simeon, without however affording any rational argument to prove they are the representatives of those tribes of Israel. Yet it is upon these grounds alone that the advocates of the Afghan theory have relied for the establishment of their hypothesis; and it is fortunate therefore for us, in asserting a contrary opinion, to be able to trace those two particular tribes existing in their own land, among the rest of their nation long after the Assyrian conquest.

With regard to traditions among the Afghans, if they are at all to be relied on, we are informed that they declare themselves to be descended from a certain Afghana, who they say was a son of King Saul, and therefore of the tribe of Benjamin, and that their ancestors were taken away captives from Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar. Such a tradition is entirely unworthy of attention; but the reasoning upon it, that it shows an Israelitish descent, only mistaken in its particular statement, is a conclusion, however ingeniously argued, that can as little be allowed. If traditions are at all admissible, the modern Samaritans, or Sichemites, have a still better claim to this descent, as, according to Basnage, they held themselves to be "of the tribe of Joseph, by Ephraim and Manasseh, and of the tribe of Levi;" and it should be remembered, that among the ancient Israelites the name of the tribe of Joseph had been merged in Ephraim and Manasseh, so as to have become obsolete at the time of the captivity.

But all arguments on the claim of the Afghans to this descent may be dispensed with in consideration of their real history. Our most eminent modern orientalists, Mountstuart Elphinstone and the late Mr. T. M. Dickinson (Journal of

the Asiatic Society, vol. iv. p. 246), reject it; and from Lieutenant Leech's valuable vocabulary of the languages west of the Indus (Proceedings of the Bombay Geographical Society for 1838), we learn that the Afghans were "originally a Turkish or Moghal nation, but that at present they are a mixed race, consisting of the inhabitants of Ghaur, the Turkish tribe of Khilji, and the Perso-Indian tribes dwelling between the eastern branches of the Hindu Kush and the upper parts of the Indus." Respecting the tribe of Joseph, noticed among them, we are expressly informed that they have been settled only about 300 years on the upper parts of the Indus, having been originally emigrants from the country of the Beluches, about Kelati Nassir. If therefore this tribe or family of Joseph are descendants of the Israelitish tribe, all those cognate people above-mentioned must be entitled to the same distinction also, though their traditions, appellations, manners, and institutions afford decided proofs to the contrary. In respect of language, we find that this Afghan tribe of Joseph shows no affinity to the Hebrew; but, as might be expected from their historical origin, it is "a dialect of Hindee, containing Sanscrit and Persian words." Under these circumstances we may unhesitatingly pronounce the hypothesis of the Afghans being descendants of the ten tribes of Israel, to be little more feasible than that propounded of the Americans.

Other writers, Buchanan, Wolff, Samuel, the American missionary Grant, and others, have offered other suppositions as to the localities in which the lost tribes may be traced. But if the arguments herein suggested of their real history be well-founded, it will be quite unnecessary to enter into any lengthened discussion as to their respective theories, inasmuch as before they are entered upon, the basis of the inquiry should be first determined, whether these tribes can be said to have ever been lost at all! The tradition that they had gone bodily into some distant and unknown region, has been so generally and so unhesitatingly admitted by grave historians, philosophers and divines, as well as by speculative theorists, that it seems scarcely necessary to quote evidences of such hallucinations, though the facts must in fairness be stated which are intended to be questioned.

Turner, in his 'Sacred History of the World,' says, "From this time we hear no more of the ten tribes, nor is it known whether any of their descendants are in the world at present, though it is thought by many that there is a remnant in some region yet unvisited." (Vol. iii. p. 430.)

Milman, in his 'History of the Jews,' writes, "From this

period history loses sight of the ten tribes as a distinct people. Prideaux supposes they were totally lost and absorbed in the nations among whom they settled; but imagination has loved to follow them into remote and inaccessible regions, where it is supposed they still await the restoration of the twelve tribes to their native land; or it has traced the Jewish features, language, and religion in different tribes, particularly in the Afghans of India, and, in a still wilder spirit of romance, in the (aboriginal) Americans." (Vol. i. p. 247.)

The American missionary Grant, in his 'Nestorians, or the Lost Tribes,' to which we may afterwards revert, says, "We shall not be expected to attempt a refutation of these various theories, none of which have been supported by sufficient evidence to produce anything like a general conviction in their favour. The ten tribes of Israel are still as really the lost tribes as they ever have been." (P. 105.)

Our last quotation on this point shall be from the Rev. C. Forster's imaginative work, 'The One Primæval Language,' in which he gives also a 'New Key for the Recovery of the Lost Ten Tribes,' prefacing it by observing, "The most interesting problem in the history of the world, as yet unsolved, unquestionably is the national existence and local habitation of the lost ten tribes of Israel. The fact of their existence indeed stands certified by the sure word of prophecy; but the place or places of their banishment have been so long buried in the womb of time, that all efforts heretofore have seemed labour in vain to draw them from their living tomb." (Vol. iii. p. 238.)

These references, which might easily be extended to the proportions of a volume, will suffice to show how general has been the belief of the ten tribes having become lost, and how varied and fanciful have been the theories held respecting them. For the supposition of such a loss, and the theories advanced for their discovery, the whole groundwork and authority has been a passage in the Apocryphal work named Esdras, chapter 13 of the 2nd book, in which the writer says he "dreamed a dream," part of which was interpreted to him as follows: "And whereas thou sawest that he gathered another peaceable multitude unto him; those are the ten tribes which were carried away prisoners out of their own land in the time of Osea the king, whom Salmanassar of Assyria led away captive, and he carried them over the waters, and so came they into another land. But they took this counsel among themselves, that they would leave the multitude of the heathen, and go forth into a further country where never mankind dwelt; that they might

there keep their statutes, which they never kept in their own land. And they entered into Euphrates by the narrow passages of the river. For the Most High then showed signs for them, and held still the flood till they were passed over. For through that country there was a great way to go, namely of a year and a half, and the same region is called Arsareth. Then dwelt they there until the latter time, and now when they shall begin to come, the Highest shall stay the springs of the stream again, that they may go through; therefore sawest thou the multitude with peace."

This narrative, therefore, precise as it appears to be in its details, is nevertheless given avowedly only as the interpretation of a dream, and not as an actual occurrence. Yet, such as it is, this is all the groundwork of authority upon which so many theories have been formed as to the fate of the ten tribes, thereon alleged to have been lost. Supposing, however, that it is not to be considered as of the nature of a vision, but given historically, as Sir William Jones and others have thought proper to receive it, the first question arising on the consideration of such an extraordinary isolated narrative would be, the credit due to it, as determinable from the character of the work in which it was found, or the probabilities of truth apparent in the narrative itself. With regard to the former point of estimate, the character of the work, this book of Esdras may certainly be pronounced to be as worthless as any in the Apocryphal collection. It is evidently of very late compilation, for it speaks of Jesus Christ (ch. viii. 28—9); and the learned Dean Prideaux, in his inestimable work, 'The Old and New Testament Connected,' rightly designates it as "a bundle of fables, too absurd for the belief of the Romanists themselves, for they have not taken this book into their canon, though they have those of Tobit and of Bel and the Dragon." (Sub ann. A. C. 610 and A. C. 446.)

Nor is the narrative trustworthy in itself, judging from any inherent probability we can allow it to possess. Even if we could suppose that a people so prone to idolatry as the Israelites had been in their own land, and separated for so many generations from the more systematic observance of the Law at Jerusalem, should, upon being carried away captives into a foreign country, become all at once so zealous for that law as to leave the multitude of the heathen and go forth into a further country where never mankind dwelt, that they might there keep their statutes, which it is with great simplicity acknowledged they never kept in their own land, we may next ask, How can we conceive it pro-

bable that captives, scattered among their conquerors, should have freedom of action enough allowed them, either to take such counsel among themselves, or, at any rate, to put it into effect?

The narrative further implies, if it is really to be taken as historically true, that the Most High was pleased to show wonders on behalf of these ten tribes in their resolves, similar to those manifested on the delivery of their fathers from Egypt. But if such manifestations had in truth been afforded them, we might surely expect that some further narration of them would have been given us, such as that which was given by Moses; and the fact that we have no such narration, is of itself a sufficient argument against the probability of the supposed occurrence.

We have not, however, to rely on any mere supposition to dispute the credit due to this interpretation of the dream, inasmuch as the whole tenor of Scriptural, Apocryphal, and other history will be found to supply us with abundant proofs of its being altogether visionary.

From the Scriptures themselves we learn it was ordained, 1st, That after the period allotted for the captivity of Judah, the whole or main body of the Israelites should return into their own land; and, 2nd, That they should return as one people, with the old distinction of tribes in a great measure done away with. This is evident from the whole course of prophecy respecting them, fulfilled as it was in their subsequent history.

In the 37th chapter of Ezekiel, written in the province of Babylon, it is expressly declared, "Moreover, thou Son of Man, take thee one stick and write upon it, For Judah, and for the children of Israel his companions; then take another stick and write upon it, For Joseph, the stick of Ephraim, and for *all the house* of Israel his companions; and join them one to another into one stick, and they shall become one in thine hand. And when the children of thy people shall speak unto thee, saying, Wilt thou not show us what thou meanest by these? Say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God; Behold, I will take the stick of Joseph, which is in the hand of Ephraim, and the tribes of Israel his fellows, and will put them with the stick of Judah, and make them one stick, and they shall be one in mine hand. And say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God; Behold, I will take the children of Israel from among the heathen, *whither they be gone*, and will gather them on every side and bring them into their own land; and I will make them one nation in the hand upon the mountains of Israel, and one king shall be king to them

all; and they shall be no more two nations, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all."

The above prophecy was declared during the Babylonian captivity, and the expression, "I will take the children of Israel from among the heathen, whither they be gone," shows clearly that it had reference to that same captivity, and to the restoration which followed so shortly after. Isaiah prophesied upwards of one hundred years before the Babylonian captivity, and he repeats the same declaration in the 11th chapter: "And He shall set up an ensign for the nations, and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth. The envy of Ephraim shall depart, and the adversaries of Judah shall be cut off; Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim." The whole chapter is deeply instructive, as it shows throughout a reference to the captivity which the Israelites were then actually suffering in Assyria: "And it shall come to pass in that day, the Lord shall set his hand again the *second* time to recover the remnant of his people which shall be left, from ASSYRIA and from Egypt," &c. And again, "And there shall be an highway for the remnant of His people which shall be left, from ASSYRIA; like as it was to Israel in the day that he came up out of the land of Egypt." Here, then, the repeated mention of Assyria with Edom, Moab, and the children of Ammon, combined with our knowledge of subsequent events, must show clearly that these predictions referred to the state of Judæa after the return of the Israelites from their captivity, when they enjoyed, for nearly five centuries, a degree of liberty and quietude possessed by perhaps no other nation in the world at the time.

The prophet Hosea was contemporary with Isaiah, long before the Babylonian captivity, and he declared the will of the Almighty to the same effect, chap. i.: "Then shall the children of Judah and the children of Israel be gathered together, and appoint themselves one head, and they shall come up out of the land; for great shall be the day of Jezreel." To the same effect prophesied Jeremiah, long after, at the time of the Babylonian invasion, chap. iii.: "In those days the house of Judah shall walk with the house of Israel, and *they shall come together out of the land of the north* to the land that I have given for an inheritance unto your fathers."

Not to multiply quotations at present unnecessarily which may hereafter be more fully noticed, these references will be sufficient to show that it was ordained for the Israelites of

the ten revolted tribes, as well as for their brethren of Judah, to return "from the land of the heathen, whither they had gone," at the time of the prediction. The exact fulfilment of the prophecy in the subsequent history of the people proves that it was declared with reference to the return from captivity under the decrees of Cyrus and his successors, and not to any yet unfulfilled events in the course of futurity, as has been taken for granted by those who have supposed the ten tribes lost at that time. When we can show so decidedly that they were fulfilled in the course of subsequent events, we can have no hesitation in pronouncing them to be applicable to that restoration; and, therefore, having been fulfilled, we ought not now to consider them connected with any future contingencies.

The prophets above referred to all lived long before the return of the Israelites from captivity; but there was one other, who lived contemporary with the return, to whose writings, therefore, it is most important that we should look, for an exact understanding of the events to which the former prophecies, as well as his own, referred. The decree of Cyrus for the return of the Israelites to Jerusalem was issued in the year 536 B. C., and it was confirmed by one of Darius in the early part of his reign, which commenced fifteen years after the first-mentioned decree. In the second year of Darius came the word of the Lord to Zechariah, encouraging the people to proceed with the rebuilding of the temple, and repeating the former promises to strengthen them in their work, by the hopes and prospects of their approaching consummation. In the 8th chapter then, we find the prophet commissioned to say, "Thus saith the Lord God, I am returned unto Zion, and will dwell in the midst of Jerusalem. .... Thus saith the Lord of Hosts, Behold, I will save my people from the east country and the west country, and I will bring them, and they shall dwell in the midst of Jerusalem..... And it shall come to pass, that as ye were a curse among the heathen, O house of Judah and house of Israel, so will I save you, and ye shall be a blessing." Here the house of Judah and house of Israel are so expressly joined together as to prove that the passages referred to the time and events then passing as the accomplishment of former prophecies. Other passages following carry out a fuller proof of this ordinance intended. In the 10th chapter we find the same declarations continued: "And I will strengthen the house of Judah, and I will save the house of Joseph, and I will bring them to place them; for I have mercy upon them, and they shall be as though I had not cast them

off. . . . . And I will bring them again also out of the land of Egypt, and *gather them out of Assyria;* and I will bring them into the land of Gilead and Lebanon, and place shall not be found for them." Now as in this verse the mention of Egypt must refer to the migration of those who fled thither after the murder of Gedaliah, narrated in the last chapter of the 2nd book of Kings, ("And all the people, both small and great, and the captains and the armies, arose and came to Egypt, for they were afraid of the Chaldeans,") so the mention of Assyria must also refer to those captives taken away by the Assyrians, namely those of the ten tribes. The evident meaning is, that all should return, from the first of those who had gone away under the Assyrian subjugation to the last of those under the Babylonian, so that the predictions included them all.

If, however, there can be any doubt remaining on the subject, and if these passages be not sufficiently convincing as to the real intention of the prophetic declarations bearing on the events then in course of fulfilment, we have only to turn to the 9th chapter as conclusive, 12th verse: "Turn you to the stronghold, ye prisoners of hope; even to-day do I declare that I will render double unto thee. When I have bent Judah for me, filled the bow with Ephraim, and raised up thy sons, O Zion, against thy sons, O Greece, and made thee as the sword of a mighty man." Can there, we may repeat it, be any doubt as to these passages joining Judah and Ephraim together with Zion specifically against Greece by name, referring distinctly to the wars of the Maccabees especially, and to the other contests of the people of God with the successors of Alexander? Can there be any doubt that the former predictions were then fulfilled, which promised the children of Judah and the children of Israel should return together, and appoint to themselves one head, and be no more two nations, nor be divided into two kingdoms any more at all?

Such are the conclusions fairly deducible from the whole tenor of the prophetic declarations; but it is not upon them alone that we have to depend for the elucidation of this question. In the historical and other parts of the Scriptures, agreeing with the prophets, we have abundant evidences of the predictions having been fulfilled. In Ezra we have the circumstances of the return of the Israelites to the Holy Land historically detailed, and from it we learn that Cyrus, in the first year of his reign, 536 B. C., "made a proclamation throughout *all* his kingdom, and put it also in writing, saying, Thus saith Cyrus, king of Persia, The Lord God of

heaven hath given me all the kingdoms of the earth, and he hath charged me to build him an house at Jerusalem. Who is there among you of *all* his people? His God be with him, and let him go up to Jerusalem, and build the house of the Lord God of Israel." From the terms of this proclamation, it is clear that the privilege granted to return to Judæa was not restricted to the children of the captivity at Babylon, but extended throughout all the kingdom, to all the people who chose to avail themselves of it. Of these the narrative proceeds to say, "Then rose up the chief of the fathers of Judah and Benjamin, and the priests and the Levites, with *all* them whose spirit God had raised to go up to build the house of the Lord." It was naturally to be supposed that the chief of the fathers of Judah and Benjamin, and the priests and the Levites, should take the lead on such an occasion; but of those who went up with them, we cannot conclude from the enumeration by their families that they were confined to the tribes of Judah, Benjamin, and Levi only.

The second chapter of Ezra begins with reciting the names "of the children of the province that went up out of the captivity," and then gives the general enumeration (ver. 2) of "the number of the men *of the people of Israel*," as "the children of Parosh 2172, the children of Shephatiah 372," and others. Some of these names — Parosh, Shephatiah, Arah, Pahath Moab, Elam, and the rest, — seem certainly to have been names of individuals, but the larger portion seems rather to have been names of places, principally of Judah and Benjamin, though some we might trace beyond the boundaries of those tribes. Where, however, it must be almost entirely a conjecture, it would be perhaps not only futile, but also a weakening of the argument, to attempt to identify any of these names with the ancient names of places or families, and therefore we may proceed at once to observe, that at verse 59 it is stated, there were some claiming to be Israelites who could not even "show their father's house, and their seed, whether they were of Israel," and yet they were not rejected on that account, except as from the priesthood. If they had been captives of the Babylonians within seventy years previously, they could scarcely have failed in being able to show their father's house; but if they were of the Assyrian captivity, which was 150 years previous to the Babylonian, it was extremely probable that after the lapse of upwards of two hundred years, many would have been found unable to do so, though they might have been unquestionably what they claimed to be — of the seed

of Israel. Maimonides, a writer of the highest authority among the Jews, distinctly states that "from the time of Sennacherib the distinction of tribes and families no longer existed" (quoted by the Rev. J. Samuel in 'The Remnant Found,' page 23), and this is strictly in accordance with probability in the case of people taken away captives and dispersed among their conquerors. On the same ground we may suppose that the classifying of those who came back, not by their tribes, but apparently by the places from which they or their fathers came in the Holy Land, as Parosh, Arah, Pahath Moab, Elam, Senaah and others, would imply that with them also the original distinction of tribes had fallen into disuse.

One of the most remarkable circumstances to be noted in the book of Ezra is, that notwithstanding the total separation of the people before the Assyrian captivity into two distinct kingdoms, during the existence of which two distinct kingdoms the revolted tribes alone were designated as Israelites, and the other two tribes as the people of Judah, yet immediately afterwards the people collectively are called by the former name of Israelites only. If those who returned from the captivity were peculiarly of the tribes of Judah and Benjamin with the Levites, this designation could scarcely have been applied to them contrary to the former practice, without at least some passing remark. But if it pleased the Almighty, as declared by the prophet Micah, who lived in the reign of Hezekiah, 150 years before the Babylonian captivity, to bring all together to their ancient habitations, then the phrase became justly applicable to the people as representatives of all the tribes. "I will surely assemble, O Jacob, all of thee; I will surely gather the remnant of Israel; I will put them together as the sheep of Bozrah, as the flock in the midst of the fold." (Micah, ii. ver. 12.) Many years afterwards the people became known as Jews, as being inhabitants of Judæa, collectively, from this name of the principal tribe among them, though the name was also sometimes applied to the people of Judah before the captivity. But on this very account it becomes the more remarkable, that immediately afterwards they should have lost this name, and should be always designated by the peculiar appellation of those who had revolted from them. Unless therefore a large portion of the Israelites of the revolted tribes had joined themselves anew to their brethren of Judah, and so rendered it peculiarly just for the general name to be resumed, we can scarcely expect that it would have been done; we might rather have expected that the exclusive ap-

pellation of Jews, by which they had been known in the time of Hezekiah, and were known again in the time of our Saviour, would have been commonly adopted.

In accordance further with the assumption that hereafter all the tribes were to be amalgamated as one people, we find the records of the people after the subjugation of Samaria by the Assyrians, so far as they are specifically detailed, giving us incidental notices of other tribes besides those of Judah, Benjamin, and Levi, both before the taking of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, and after their general return under Cyrus and his successors.

Of the numbers led away captive by the Assyrians we have no distinct accounts, but learn that Shalmaneser, king of Assyria, "went up to Samaria and besieged it three years. In the ninth year of Hoshea, the king of Assyria took Samaria, and carried Israel away into Assyria, and placed them in Halah and in Habor by the river of Gozan, and in the cities of the Medes" (2 Kings, xvii. ver. 6). During the three years of siege, the country must have become exceedingly desolated, so that when Shalmaneser took away his captives, who were probably those taken in arms and the principal inhabitants, he found it advisable to bring men from Babylon and other localities, and place them in the cities of Samaria instead of the children of Israel. This however he may be supposed to have done for the purpose of giving the land a more tractable population, or for the purpose of restoring it from the ravages of famine and the other consequences of war and the sword, as much as to replace those taken away. From other parts of the sacred history it is clear that a large portion of the people of Israel were left behind, and therefore we must conclude that when it is said "Israel was carried away," it is to be understood in general terms of the principal persons, and not of the main body of the people.

Samaria, as above stated, was taken by Shalmaneser in the ninth year of Hoshea, which was the sixth year of the reign of Hezekiah, king of Judah (2 Kings, xviii. ver. 10). It must have been after this event, and in apprehension of a like fate impending over Judah, that Hezekiah took counsel of his princes and all the congregation to keep a solemn passover (2 Chron. xxx. ver. 2). He then "sent to all Israel and Judah, and wrote letters also to Ephraim and Manasseh that they should come to the house of the Lord at Jerusalem to keep the passover." From this and the following verses it is apparent that a considerable portion of the people of Israel had been left behind by the Assyrians, and we may

conclude even the larger portion of them. For the narrative proceeds to state, "So they established a decree to make proclamation *throughout all Israel*, from Beersheba even unto Dan, that they should come to keep the passover at Jerusalem. So the posts went with the letters from the king and his princes *throughout all Israel and Judah;* and according to the commandment of the king, saying, Ye children of Israel, turn again unto the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Israel, and he will return to the *remnant of you that are escaped out of the hand of the kings of Assyria.*" This address then to those escaped out of the hand of the kings of Assyria, issued throughout all Israel from Beersheba to Dan, proves incontestably that all Israel had not been swept away by the Assyrians after the taking of Samaria, but that a considerable remnant had been able to escape from the captivity and remain in their own land. This is still more evident from what follows. The exact year of Hezekiah's reign in which this solemn passover was kept is not stated; but it was probably before the fourteenth year, inasmuch as it was then that Sennacherib came up against all the fenced cities of Judah and took them (2 Kings, xviii. ver. 13), which event is narrated after the particulars of this solemn assembly. Of this we are further informed: "So the posts passed from city to city through the country of Ephraim and Manasseh, even unto Zebulon, but they laughed them to scorn and mocked them. Nevertheless divers of Asher, and of Manasseh, and of Zebulon humbled themselves and came to Jerusalem. And there assembled at Jerusalem *much people* to keep the feast of unleavened bread in the second month, *a very great congregation*" (2 Chron. xxx. vv. 10—13). In the eighteenth verse we read still further, "A multitude of the people, even many of Ephraim and Manasseh, Issachar and Zebulon, had not cleansed themselves, yet did they eat the passover otherwise than was written. But Hezekiah prayed for them, and the Lord hearkened to Hezekiah and healed the people."

From these passages it is undubitable that even immediately after Israel is said to have been carried away captive by the Assyrians, there was still a large remnant of them left in their own land, among whom we have particularly specified six out of the ten tribes, namely Dan, Ephraim, Manasseh, Asher, Issachar, and Zebulon, which tribes at least may therefore be presumed to have been mainly left to become amalgamated with those of Judah and Benjamin.

The beneficial attempts of Hezekiah to reclaim the revolted tribes from the worship of idols were resumed by his

greatgrandson Josiah. This pious prince began to reign when he was eight years old, and in the twelfth year of his reign "he began to purge Judah and Jerusalem from the high places, and the groves, and the carved images, and the molten images" (2 Chron. xxxiv. ver. 3). "And so did he in the cities of Manasseh and Ephraim and Simeon, even unto Naphthali, with their mattocks round about. And when he had broken down the altars and the groves, and had beaten the graven images into powder, and cut down all the idols *throughout all the land of Israel*, he returned to Jerusalem" (v. 6. 7). This was in the twelfth year of his reign, and the narrative proceeds, "Now in the eighteenth year of his reign, when he had purged the land and the house, he sent Shaphan and others to repair the house of the Lord his God. And when they came to Hilkiah the high priest, they delivered the money that was brought into the house of God, which the Levites that kept the doors had gathered of the hand of Manasseh and Ephraim, and *of all the remnant of Israel*, and of all Judah and Benjamin."

In the same year Josiah kept another passover, like that ordained by Hezekiah; for it is said (chap. xxxv. ver. 18), "There was no passover like to that kept in Israel from the days of Samuel the prophet; neither did all the kings of Israel keep such a passover as Josiah kept, and the priests and the Levites, and all Judah and Israel that were present, and the inhabitants of Jerusalem." Here then again we find the people of the ten tribes contradistinguished from those of Judah, specifically mentioned as joining in the worship of God, nearly 100 years after the Assyrian captivity, and acknowledging the king of Judah as their natural head. For we are told in sequence of his acts (2 Chron. xxxiv. ver. 33), "And Josiah took away all the abominations out of all the countries that pertained to the children of Israel, and made all that were present in Israel to serve, even to serve the Lord their God. And all his days they departed not from following the Lord, the God of their fathers."

In the above-cited passages then, in addition to the tribes of Dan, Ephraim, Manasseh, Asher, Zebulon and Issachar, previously proved to have had a large remnant left in their own land after the Assyrian captivity, we have now two other tribes mentioned, Simeon and Naphthali, as in like manner not all carried away, the one being in the north-east extremity of Palestine, as the other was placed in the south-west. This one of Simeon, being in the south-west, was peculiarly far removed from the ravages of the Assyrians, who, coming from the north or north-east, fell undoubtedly

most furiously on the tribes of the frontiers, Naphthali, and those on the other side of the Jordan, namely Reuben, Gad, and the half-tribe of Manasseh. In the inroad made by the Assyrians under Tiglath-Pileser, we are told they "took Ijon and Abel-beth-maachah and Janoah and Kedesh and Hazor and Gilead and Galilee, all the land of Naphthali, and carried them captive to Assyria." (2 Kings xv. v. 29.) Yet even under the belief of these tribes having suffered very severely more than the others, it appears from Josiah having thus exercised his superintendence over all Israel, in "the cities of Manasseh and Ephraim and Simeon, even unto Naphthali," that there were still large bodies of the people of those tribes remaining, and inhabiting their cities in their own land, after the Assyrians had wasted their country and carried away captive a number of their brethren. If therefore the above inferences be correct, we have eight tribes out of the ten proved to have had a large portion remaining in their own land after the Assyrian captivity, among whom it is particularly deserving of notice are the tribes of Simeon, and of Ephraim and Manasseh.

Of all the theories put forward on the supposition of the ten tribes having been lost to history, that in support of the Afghans being their descendants has certainly met with most favour. For this the strongest argument adduced by its advocates is the similarity of names among this people to some among the ancient Israelites, as has been already stated; one tribe among the Afghans being now designated by themselves as the tribe of Joseph, and another by a name resembling that of Simeon. But these coincidences of names, we may repeat, afford no proof of identity with the Israelites, as the names are common to all the Eastern nations, while we are thus fortunately able to show the futility of the supposition further by tracing the tribes of Joseph and Simeon as remaining in their own land more markedly than any of the others. The preceding evidences refer to the interval between the Assyrian captivity and the Babylonian. In that interval they are distinctly proved to have had a recognized existence in their own land, after the time when they are supposed to have been carried away captive, giving us reason to conclude that only a portion, and probably but a small portion, of their main body had been carried away. Our next task is to show the probability of even that portion which had been taken away, having returned with their brethren of Judah and Benjamin and Levi, upon the promulgation of the decrees of Cyrus and his successors in their favour.

When the Israelites, upon the promulgation of these de-

crees, returned from their captivity, one of the earliest cares of their leaders seems to have been to collect as correct a genealogy as they could of the several families. In this however it is clear that they were obliged to be contented with very general statements, as not being able to prove distinct descents. The First Book of Chronicles has been always supposed to be of Ezra's compilation; and it was undoubtedly compiled, if not written, after the return from captivity. This book commences accordingly with long lists of genealogies, which led the writer or compiler to refer to events passing in his time. Referring then to the return from their captivity, he writes in the 9th chapter, "So all Israel were reckoned by genealogies, and behold they were written in the Book of the Kings of Israel and Judah, who were carried away to Babylon for their transgressions. Now the first inhabitants that dwelt in their possessions in their cities were the Israelites, the priests, Levites, and the Nethinims. And in Jerusalem dwelt of the children of Judah, and of the children of Benjamin, and *of the children of Ephraim and Manasseh.*" (v. 3.) Many of the names in the following verses are identical with those in Ezra and Nehemiah, as Sallu, the son of Meshullum, and others, showing they referred to the children of the captivity; and therefore we can have no hesitation in concluding from the passage above cited, that while the Israelites generally after their return were scattered abroad in their cities, Jerusalem itself was peopled by a mixture of the descendants, not only of Judah, but of a certain portion of the other tribes also, principally Benjamin, Ephraim and Manasseh. Of the other tribes of the Israelites we have no specific mention after the captivity, with one exception; but in direct opposition to the assumptions of those who imagine the Afghans to represent the tribes as lost, we are thus more particularly able to connect the tribes of Simeon and Joseph distinctly in their correct nomenclature of Ephraim and Manasseh, as above stated, with the restoration. The proofs in respect of the other tribe, that of Simeon, are still stronger; and in establishing them, therefore, we not only destroy the theory of their having to be found among the Afghans, but also raise a strong presumption of the probability of the other tribes having in like manner returned by the side of them.

Our argument is intended to show, that after the return from their captivity the different tribes amalgamated with Judah and Benjamin to form one people. From the above passage it is clear that Ephraim and Manasseh especially did so amalgamate, and therefore could not be included among

those said to have wandered into unknown regions, and become lost to history. Still less can this be said of the Simeonites, of whom we have still later and fuller notices. In the 4th chapter of the 1st Book of Chronicles, which was certainly written or compiled long after the return from Babylon, we find the acts of this tribe particularly detailed (v. 39 to 43): "And they (the Simeonites) went to the entrance of Gedor, to seek pasture for their flocks. And they found fat pasture and good, and the land was wide and quiet and peaceable, for they of Ham had dwelt there of old. And these written by name came in the days of Hezekiah king of Judah, and smote their tents, and the habitations that were found there, and destroyed them utterly *unto this day*, and dwelt in their rooms. And some of them, even of the sons of Simeon, 500 men, went to Mount Seir; and they smote the rest of the Amalekites that were escaped, and dwelt there *unto this day*." Here then we have direct evidence of the Simeonites also remaining in their own land in the time of Ezra, or the compiler of the Books of Chronicles, long after the return from captivity, and 250 years after the common theories suppose them to have been all carried away by the Assyrians, to become one of the lost tribes of Israel. These however are not the only traces of the Simeonites to which true history may lead us, to save the trouble of seeking them among the Afghans or elsewhere, the which traces may be hereafter more appropriately detailed.

If we examine the narratives of the Assyrian conquests with precision, we cannot but conclude that they were only of partial effect, and fell chiefly on the border tribes of Naphthali and those on the east of the Jordan, namely the Reubenites, the Gadites, and the half-tribe of Manasseh. These were the most exposed to attack and most easily removeable, so that they might be carried away more in a body, and thus be more likely to become permanently settled in the land of their captivity, as these last-mentioned tribes only are said to have been in the time of the compiler of the Chronicles. (1 Chron. v. ver. 26.) In this case, though the numbers are not in any way specified of those taken away captive, yet these might not have exceeded in any very considerable degree the numbers of those taken away from Jerusalem by the Babylonians. When taken away and distributed among the cities of Mesopotamia and Media, we cannot suppose the conquerors would have paid any regard to classifying them by their tribes, which would be keeping up distinctions such as no nation could prudently permit among

their captives. Their wisest policy would undoubtedly be to destroy every link of nationality which might keep them knitted together in bands dangerous to their masters. If these masters then really acted on this policy, it must be the extremest improbability to expect that we should have the captive Israelites remaining as distinct tribes, whether in the land of their captivity or elsewhere.

At the time of the Babylonian captivity, we are informed that the poor of the land were left to be vinedressers and husbandmen, and others escaped to them also afterwards of a higher class and in great numbers, over whom Gedaliah was appointed ruler: "Now when all the captains of the forces which were in the fields, even they and their men, heard that the King of Babylon had made Gedaliah governor in the land, then they came to Gedaliah to Mizpah; likewise all the Jews that were in Moab and among the Ammonites and in Edom returned out of all the countries whither they were driven, and came to the land of Judah." (Jeremiah, xl. v. 7 and 11.) At the same time great numbers must have perished by the concomitants of war, pestilence and famine, as well as by the sword, while those taken away were no doubt men taken in arms, with the principal persons and others available as slaves. Yet in the account given of the Babylonian conquests, we find fewer captives enumerated than we might have expected. In the 2nd Kings, ch. xxiv. v. 14, it is said that "Nebuchadnezzar carried away all Jerusalem, and all the princes and all the mighty men of valour, *even ten thousand captives*, and all the craftsmen and smiths; none remained save the poorest sort of the people." Here then we find the general expression, in the usual style of eastern amplification, "all Jerusalem, and all the princes and all the mighty men of valour," to mean at the utmost only some ten thousand captives, with the craftsmen and smiths, who could not be very numerous, as added afterwards of less account.

The phrase, "even ten thousand captives," may however be itself considered a general expression, signifying only an indefinite large number. In the 52nd chapter of Jeremiah we have a more precise account of the numbers, v. 27 and following: "Thus Judah was carried away captive out of his own land. This is the people whom Nebuchadnezzar carried away captive, in the seventh year, three thousand Jews and three and twenty. In the eighteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar he carried away captive from Jerusalem eight hundred thirty and two persons. In the three and twentieth year of Nebuchadnezzar, Nebuzaradan, the captain of the guard, carried

away captive of the Jews seven hundred forty and five persons; all the persons were four thousand and six hundred." So far from ten thousand therefore having been carried away in the first subjugation, there does not appear, according to this particular detail, to have been half that number altogether in all the invasions of Judæa carried away by the Babylonians; and yet it is described in the eastern style of amplification, "thus Judah was carried away captive out of his own land."

As however the number of 10,000 captives is stated to have been carried away by Nebuchadnezzar, though at variance with the more precise account of the contemporary writer, probably Baruch, as above cited, we may, for the sake of the argument, allow that double that number might have been carried away altogether by the Babylonians, or about 20,000 captives. When we consider the great difficulty that exists in providing for large bodies of people traversing any considerable space of country desolated by war, the above estimate may be fairly allowed as the utmost that can be reasonably assumed. When Ezra came back from Babylon with fewer than 4000 souls with him, under the most favourable circumstances, he was four months engaged in the journey; and a large army returning with so many as 10,000 captives must have taken a still longer time, and had to encounter many difficulties, which would cause great numbers to perish.

For the Israelites taken away by the Assyrians, of whom no particular numbers are recorded, we may take the above numbers as a criterion whereby to judge of their probable amount. As the people of the ten tribes were more numerous than their brethren of Judah, we may suppose double the number of them to have been carried away, or 40,000, making 60,000 captives altogether to have been carried away by the Assyrians and Babylonians. But 60,000 captives, or double that number, would be only an inconsiderable portion of the people of Samaria and Judæa, even after they had been subjected to the evils of war, pestilence, and famine for a long succession of years. Still a large remnant of them would be left, as we know a large remnant was left, which no conqueror could carry away. These would then form the main body of the nation; and if to these a large body, the majority probably of those carried away, or rather of their descendants, actually did return, we may presume justly that the predictions were then fulfilled which promised them restoration to their former possessions as one people.

Even before the Babylonian captivity, we learn from the book of Judith, that considerable numbers of those taken away by the Assyrians had returned to their own land, (ch. IV. v. 3); and it is but reasonable to suppose that all the captives would be glad to seize every opportunity of escaping from bondage and return to their kindred. As captives in a foreign land, their condition must have been very deplorable. They who "sat down by the waters of Babylon and wept," suffered only the same lot of bitterness to which their brethren at Nineveh had been subjected; and how grievous this was we have abundant evidences in the denunciations of the prophets to show us. When, therefore, under Cyrus and his successors, the Israelites all received not only permission, but encouragement and rewards even, to return, we may be assured that all the survivors would hasten to avail themselves of a boon extended to them with such extraordinary liberality. The "prisoners of hope," as the prophet Zechariah termed the captives, who had been promised for themselves and their children that "the Assyrian should be beaten down," that he should "fall with the sword," and they "should come who were ready to perish in the land of Assyria," could not fail to see in the downfall of their oppressors, and this monarch's liberality towards them, the fulfilment of the promised mercies. They could not fail to see then prepared the promised "highway for the remnant of the people which should be left from Assyria," "when the ransomed of the Lord should return and come to Zion with songs," and "the children of Israel be gathered one by one." (Isaiah XXXVII. v. 12.) This promise of restoration was not made to the captives of Judah, for Isaiah lived 140 years before the Babylonian captivity; and even after this event the promises of restoration were addressed by Jeremiah to "all the families of the house of Israel" conjointly. When therefore the promises were fulfilled with regard to Judah, it cannot be supposed that another fate and a longer captivity was reserved for the others.

The people carried away captive, both of Judah and Israel, were, as we have contended, only the principal personages of the land, who had led the people generally into idolatry, and into adopting the sinful practices of the heathen. These were then punished for their idolatry and sins, and were probably cut off in the course of the war or the subsequent captivity, until at length only the remnant was left, to whom the Almighty was pleased to show mercy and grant restoration to the land of their fathers. "Israel is a scattered sheep; first the King of Assyria hath devoured him, and last

this Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon, hath broken his bones. Therefore thus saith the Lord of Hosts, the God of Israel, Behold I will punish the King of Babylon and his land, as I have punished the King of Assyria. And I will bring Israel again to his habitation, and he shall feed on Carmel and Bashan, and his soul shall be satisfied upon Mount Ephraim and Gilead. In those days and in that time, saith the Lord, the iniquity of Israel shall be sought for, and there shall be none, and the sins of Judah, and they shall not be found, for I will *pardon them whom I reserve.*" (Jeremiah, ch. l. v. 17—20.) In a few verses previously the same prophet declared, "In those days and in that time, saith the Lord, the children of Israel shall come, they and the children of Judah together, going and weeping; they shall go, and seek the Lord their God." (v. 4.)

If it be asked to what days and to what time this and the other prophecies can be positively shown to refer, we have only to examine the context of the two verses immediately preceding: "Declare ye among the nations, Babylon is taken, Bel is confounded, Merodach is broken in pieces; for out of the north there cometh up a mighty nation against her, which shall make her land desolate, and none shall dwell therein; they shall depart both man and beast." And then immediately follows, "In those days and in that time, saith the Lord, the children of Israel shall come, they and the children of Judah together." Here then it is expressly stated, that the restoration of all the Israelites should take effect on the destruction of Babylon, as all the other prophetic declarations also pointed clearly to an early fulfilment. None of them will in any wise admit the construction put on them by the rabbinical writers originally, of being indefinitely protracted with regard to Israel, as would be the case if the prophecies were yet unfulfilled.

Whatever might be the worldly motives of Cyrus in releasing the captives, whether it was for any assistance afforded him in his conquests, or to weaken the provinces of Babylon and Assyria, or to strengthen the frontiers of his new kingdoms, it is certain that he extended to them extraordinary favours. In his reign, and also under his successors in carrying out the same policy, were then fulfilled the promises made to the Israelites by the mouth of Isaiah long before the Babylonian captivity: "They shall bring thy sons in their arms, and thy daughters shall be carried upon their shoulders; and kings shall be thy nursing fathers and their queens thy nursing mothers." (Ch. xlix. v. 22.) Thus unrestricted permission was given to all the Israelites through-

out all the Persian dominions to return. Their sacred vessels were restored to them, they had ample means granted them to proceed happily on their way, and every facility to rebuild their cities and their temple. Under such circumstances we cannot but suppose that there would be very few indeed who would not avail themselves of the favour shown them. Of those who were carried away, the greater portion no doubt consisted of males, and consequently their numbers would not increase very considerably in their state of bondage. Baruch, in his prayer at Babylon, says, "Let thy wrath turn from us; for we are but a few left among the heathen, where thou hast scattered us." (Ch. ii. v. 13.) And he refers to the threat long before expressed by Moses as then fulfilled: "If ye will not hear my voice, surely this very great multitude shall be turned into a small number among the nations where I will scatter them." (v. 29.) Though still many thousands in number then, the captives were yet nevertheless few in proportion to what they might have been under other circumstances, and this consideration must be taken into account when estimating the relative numbers of those who were carried away and of those who returned.

Bearing then in mind that the numbers of one captivity alone are given as 10,000 captives, and taking that as a criterion by which to judge of the extent of the others, we may compare the number of those carried away and of those who returned as nearly equal, showing therefore that the great majority of the true Israelites must have then actually returned to their own land. When they were enumerated on the occasion of the first return under Zerubbabel, we learn "that the whole congregation together was 42,360, besides their servants and their maids, of whom there were 7337." (Ezra, ii. ver. 64.) In this passage it is not clear whether the "whole congregation" included the males only, or the whole population. Josephus gives the numbers of males and females separately, though the eleventh book of his work, in which this narrative is contained, may be considered of doubtful authenticity. It seems to bear evident traces of having been wrongly dealt with, as it contains much apocryphal matter, and in more than one respect is inconsistent with itself. In the early part it gives a statement of numbers as 42,462, nearly agreeing with that in Ezra, but immediately after starts into another narrative, the same in substance as that given in the apocryphal book of Esdras, both totally and palpably erroneous. Instead of placing the restoration under Zerubbabel in the reign of Cyrus, he now places it in the reign of Darius, and although he had just previously

given the number of the congregation as 42,462, he now makes it amount to nearly 5,000,000, with the correct number of servants 7337, but with the remarkable addition of another number of 40,742 for the "women and children mixed together." The statement of the 5,000,000 may be an error of the transcribers, for which Josephus should not be considered responsible, and it is possible that he may be correct in enumerating the women and children separately, as it is not inconsistent with the statement in Ezra of the whole congregation, if that is to be understood as consisting of the males only. In this case the gross amount would give us a total of 90,439 souls returning with Zerubbabel, being the first portion of those who took advantage of the decree of Cyrus, seventy-eight years before the coming of Ezra.

If however this aggregate should not be allowed us as correct, and if the number of 42,360, with the servants 7337, be considered to include the whole number of souls that returned with Zerubbabel, still it is manifest that it is double the number of those whom we can estimate as having been carried away to Babylon at the least, even if we grant that double the number of 10,000 captives mentioned in the book of Kings had been taken away by the Babylonians, while it is ten times greater than the numbers given in Jeremiah as actually carried away. The latter account, as given with so much particularity by one who was evidently a contemporary writer, must be acknowledged to be the most trustworthy, and in that case we cannot suppose the 4600 to have increased to upwards of 42,000 under the circumstances above stated, during the seventy years of their captivity. To reconcile the numbers with probability therefore, we must consider the congregation of 42,360 to include a large portion of the Assyrian captivity also, especially when we remember that other bodies of the captives seem to have been returning from time to time, besides those who came afterwards with Ezra and Nehemiah, who would swell those numbers considerably still further.

We have already observed that in the enumeration of genealogies in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, the several parties of those who returned seem to be mentioned more as with reference to places from which they reckoned their origin than to families, while another portion was found who were not able to show their father's house, or their tribe, and yet were allowed to join the nation as Israelites. But in this enumeration we have also another circumstance worthy of notice. Though Ezra and Nehemiah both state the number of the congregation to have been 42,360, yet the former in

the particular enumeration of the families or parties returning, respectively gives account of only 29,818 persons, and Nehemiah of 31,031. This makes a discrepancy of one-fourth, and to explain it, Dean Prideaux says, "The meaning is, they are only the tribes of Judah, Benjamin, and Levi that are reckoned by their families in both these places; the rest, being of the other tribes of Israel, are numbered only in the gross sum, and this is that which makes the gross sum so much exceed the particulars in both computations."

There may be another way of explaining the discrepancy by supposing that the three-fourths particularized as having returned, consisted of portions of all the twelve tribes, though principally of Judah, Benjamin, and Levi, and the other fourth of the remnant left in their own land, descendants of those who had not been carried away captive and then present in Jerusalem. But whatever may be the more probable explanation, it is clear from the above passage that Dr. Milman is mistaken in representing Prideaux to have supposed the Israelites of the ten tribes to have been "totally lost and absorbed in the nations among whom they settled." On the contrary, he supposes, as above shown, that a large portion of them returned and became absorbed among their brethren of Judah and Benjamin, though he at the same time concluded that "many more remained in Chaldea, Assyria, and other eastern provinces than those who settled again in Judæa."

It must be with great distrust of his individual opinion that any one may now venture to express a dissent from the conclusions of so eminent an authority; but if the computations above detailed be correct of those taken away captive, and of those who returned, the inference rather seems to be, that a much larger portion returned than what could or would have remained. Still more so when we consider that the numbers of those who returned as above-mentioned with Zerubbabel, must have been vastly increased by those who escaped before or returned afterwards in a desultory manner at different intervals, besides by those who came in a more authorized and systematic manner with Ezra, seventy-eight years after Zerubbabel, or with Nehemiah twelve years after Ezra, or under similar auspices. If we take all these questions into consideration, we cannot come to any other conclusion than that a vast majority of those who had been carried away captive, or of their descendants, must have returned on the permission given them, to the land of their fathers, and that the numbers that returned must have consisted of members of the ten tribes, as well as of those of

Judah, Benjamin, and Levi. Their subsequent conduct also in their own land proved the fulfilment of the prophecies, in their adherence to their law under all circumstances, though this has been the subject of a too customary sarcasm from the historian Gibbon. In contradistinction to the example of their forefathers, who had so often relapsed into idolatry, the restored nation ran rather into the other extreme, until at length they even fell into the errors of an excess of formality and of pharisaical hypocrisy.

Beyond the conclusions, however, that we have to deduce from the positive statements in the sacred history, we may observe that there were several acts of the people, on their return, very significant of their having become an amalgamation or union at least of all the tribes. When the temple was rebuilt under Zerubbabel, which was in the sixth year of Darius, and twentieth after their return, we are told in Ezra, ch. vi. ver. 16, "And the children of Israel, the priests, and the Levites, and the rest of the children of the captivity, kept the dedication of this house with joy. And offered at the dedication 100 bullocks, 200 rams, 400 lambs, and for a sin offering for all Israel, twelve he-goats, according to the number of the tribes of Israel." In this passage, as in several others, the children of the captivity seem to be specifically mentioned, as distinct from others of the congregation who had not shared in the captivity; and the fact of twelve he-goats being sacrificed, according to the number of the twelve tribes of Israel, is the first notice of such a sacrifice, after the separation of the ten tribes from the house of David.

In the same manner Ezra, fifty-eight years afterwards, when he arrived at Jerusalem, and delivered the silver and the gold, and the vessels he brought with him, adds, ch. viii. ver. 35, "Also the children of those that had been carried away, which were come out of the captivity, offered burnt-offerings unto the God of Israel, twelve bullocks for all Israel, ninety and six rams, seventy and seven lambs, twelve he-goats for a sin offering." This, it must be again observed, was contrary to the former practice of offerings since the revolt of the ten tribes. When Hezekiah offered a similar sacrifice, it is said (2 Chron. xxix. ver. 21), "And they brought seven bullocks, and seven rams, and seven lambs, and seven he-goats for a sin offering for the kingdom, and for the sanctuary, and for Judah." Thus then it seems that the twelve he-goats offered on the first occasion above-mentioned, and twelve bullocks with twelve he-goats on the second, must be understood as signifying the sacrifices to have been

offered for the twelve tribes, as represented there at the time. With reference to these offerings, the late Bishop Tomline remarks, "it seems to indicate that some of all the tribes returned from captivity," (Elements of Christian Theology, vol. i. p. 214); but we may judge that it indicates more, and that it shows the ten tribes to have been all considered there present, forming one people.

Under the government of Nehemiah, who came to Jerusalem twelve years after Ezra, another assembly of the children of Israel is recorded, "with fasting, and with sackclothes and earth upon them," but no specification of the sacrifices is given. The prayer, however, then delivered is given at length, and in it we find the following passage, "Now therefore our God, the great, the mighty, and the terrible, who keepest covenant and mercy, let not all the trouble seem little before Thee that hath come upon us, on our kings, on our princes, and on our priests, and on our prophets, and on our fathers, and on all thy people, since the time of the kings of Assyria unto this day." (ch. ix. ver. 32.) Here the mention of "our fathers and all thy people since the time of the kings of Assyria," cannot but be understood as referring to the ten tribes specially, rather than to those of Judah and Benjamin only, inasmuch as the latter suffered comparatively little from the Assyrians, who in fact, under Sennacherib, "returned with shame of face from before them."

If the above considerations fail of ensuring a conviction that the main body of the remnant of all the twelve tribes was understood to be gathered together at Jerusalem as one people, after the return from Babylon under Zerubbabel and Ezra, according to the prophecies above detailed, still it must be conceded that there is not any ground in all the sacred writings in our canon, for the supposition that any of them ever wandered away into unknown or remote and inaccessible regions. As far as the Old Testament teaches us their later history, our arguments may perhaps be pronounced only matters of inference; but how can the authority of the New Testament be explained away in its more direct declarations of the twelve tribes being then still existing? St. Paul, in his address to king Agrippa, whom he knew "to be expert in all customs and questions among the Jews," reminds him of the "promise unto which our twelve tribes instantly serving God day and night hope to come." (Acts, ch. xxvi. ver. 7.) And St. James, the brother of our Lord, addresses his general epistle "to the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad." Had the ten tribes really wandered away into unknown or

remote and inaccessible regions, St. Paul could never have subjected himself to be reminded by Agrippa that they were lost, nor would St. James have inscribed his epistle to those who could not be found to receive it.

Such are the proofs and deductions to be drawn from the sacred Scriptures, in correction of the fable to which so many learned men, as well as others on their authority, have given so much undeserved credit. In the Apocryphal writings, with the exception of the dream in Esdras, the innocent cause perhaps of so many fanciful theories respecting the ten tribes, we have no references to them but what are in strict accordance with the preceding statements. The book of Esdras is in a great measure compiled from that of Ezra, beyond which it is utterly worthless as an authority. It however repeats the accounts given in Ezra of the sacrifices and other circumstances already detailed, with one addition worthy of notice. Narrating the preparations made to return to Judæa, it says, "After this were the principal men of the families chosen according to their tribes to go up." (ch. v. ver. 1.) Here the phrase "according to their tribes," seems to convey a larger signification than we can imagine would be implied if there were only two or three tribes returning.

The book of Judith is the only other work in the Apocrypha to which it is necessary to advert, and it is valuable as showing, that even before the Babylonian captivity, many of those taken away by the Assyrians had already returned (ch. iv. ver. 3), "Now the children of Israel that dwelt in Judæa, heard all that Holofernes had done to the nations; Therefore they were exceedingly afraid, and were troubled for Jerusalem, and for the temple of the Lord their God. For they were newly returned from the captivity, and all the people of Judæa were lately gathered together, and the vessels and the altar and the house were sanctified after the profanation." From this then it appears that the temple, though profaned, had not been yet destroyed, and the mention of their being again sanctified, with other circumstances in the narrative, might lead us to believe the reference to be to the latter years of the long reign of Manasseh. Judith herself was of the tribe of Simeon (ch. ix. ver. 2), as was also her husband (ch. viii. ver. 2), and Ozias, the ruler of her city of Bethulia (ch. vi. ver. 15). This city seems then to have been a possession of the Simeonites, but distinctly from that branch of them already mentioned as remaining in the lands they had taken from the Amalekites, from the time of Hezekiah to that of the compiler of the book of Chronicles. (1 Book, ch. iv. ver. 41—43.) It is of little impor-

tance to the argument whether the book of Judith be a mere fable or not. We may even concede it to be very probably only a "religious romance," though Prideaux "was inclined most to think it a true history." But it is undoubtedly a very ancient composition, perhaps written even before the Babylonian captivity, to which it makes no allusion; and the author could scarcely have represented Bethulia to be then inhabited by the Simeonites, unless it had been so in reality.

Turning to other writers besides those of the sacred Scriptures and the Apocrypha, we are not without some further aid to carry on our inquiries. We have already referred to Josephus, as an author held in considerable estimation, though his works, as Dean Prideaux observes, "have in them many great and manifest mistakes," which compel us to receive his statements with great caution. No part of them is so particularly open to this remark as the eleventh book of his 'Antiquities of the Jews,' wherein, as Prideaux adds, "he frequently varies from Scripture, from history, and common sense, which manifestly proves it to have been the least considered and the worst digested of all that he hath written." (Connexion of the Old and New Testament, vol. i. p. 290.) In this eleventh book, so justly stigmatized, Josephus has particularly shown his want of judgment in adopting the fables of the apocryphal book of Esdras respecting the return of the Israelites from their captivity, rather than the narrative in the canonical book of Ezra. Yet even he in so doing has passed over entirely the marvellous dream of the ten tribes going into a "further country where never mankind dwelt, that they might there keep their statutes, which they never kept in their own land." On the other hand, his testimony, such as it is, directly contradicts it, though it is not otherwise conformable to the arguments we have ventured to sustain. According to his statements, when Esdras, as he terms Ezra, received the epistle of king Xerxes, permitting his return to Jerusalem with the favours granted him, he "sent a copy of it to all those of his own nation that were in Media, and when these Jews had understood what piety the king had towards God, and what kindness he had for Ezra, they were all greatly pleased, nay, many of them took their effects with them and came to Babylon, as very desirous of going down to Jerusalem; but then the entire body of the people of Israel remained in that country; wherefore there are but two tribes in Asia and Europe subject to the Romans, while the ten tribes are beyond the Euphrates till now, and are an immense multitude,

and not to be estimated by numbers." (Antiquities of the Jews, book xi. ch. v. § 2.) In his 'History of the Wars of the Jews,' Josephus represents king Agrippa asking the people, "Does any of you extend his hopes as far as beyond the Euphrates, and suppose that those of your own nation that dwell in Adiabene will come to your assistance? But certainly these will not embarrass themselves with an unjust war, nor, if they will follow such ill advice, will the Parthians permit them so to do, for it is their concern to maintain the truce that is between them and the Romans, and they will be supposed to break the covenant between them, if any under their government march against the Romans." (Book ii. ch. 16. § 4.)

From these passages it appears, that though in the time of Josephus there was beyond the Euphrates an immense multitude of Israelites, descendants of the ten tribes, as he declares them, yet they were still under the government and control of the Parthians. To the same effect St. Jerome, in the 5th century, as has been also previously stated, says, "Unto this day the ten tribes are subject to the kings of the Parthians; nor has their captivity ever been loosed." And again, "The ten tribes inhabit at this day the cities and mountains of the Medes." These statements are at any rate decisive against the story of those tribes having taken counsel among themselves to leave the multitude of the heathen and go forth into a "further country where never mankind dwelt." But we have further to contend, that both Josephus and St. Jerome were misinformed in these particulars, especially the former, in saying that the main body of the Israelites remained beyond the Euphrates, and that there were in his time only two tribes in Europe and Asia subject to the Romans.

Beyond the supposition of a mistake, however, on this point, we may find in the contents of the 11th book of the 'Antiquities' good reason to conclude, that it has not been handed down to us correctly as Josephus wrote it. Whatever commendations have been passed on him by early writers "as a lover of truth," must be considered as referring to the 'History of the Wars,' of which, as an agent in them on the part of the Romans against his own country, he gave an account agreeable to the Gentile world, such as to merit their approbation. They neither knew nor cared aught about the ancient history of the Jews, and his may justly be pronounced exceedingly fallacious. The most learned of modern critics, Casaubon, Brinch and others (as collected in Havercamp's edition, Ams. 1726), have been

unsparing in their censures of it; and even Bayle could not repress his indignation that one professing himself a Jew could bring himself to contradict so explicitly as he does the books of Moses and the other sacred writings of his nation. But the 11th book is not only inconsistent with the Scriptual history, but also with itself, for it gives two different accounts of the return of the Israelites from captivity, such as we can scarcely imagine how any person of common discernment could have repeated in one and the same book. Yet Josephus was certainly no ordinary character; and as this charge may be so distinctly alleged against him, we can only charitably account for it by surmising, that the work has been falsified, and is not handed down to us correctly as he wrote it.

In the beginning of this 11th book, Josephus agrees with the sacred narrative given by Ezra as to the return of the Israelites from captivity under Cyrus, but immediately after states that this event took place under Darius, under quite different circumstances. These he then details in almost the same manner as is done in the Apocryphal Esdras, representing that the restoration took place under the favour of the latter monarch, and yet consecutively he returns to the canonical history, in opposition to what he had just stated. He says that the people, having proceeded to rebuild the temple, the rulers of Syria and Phœnicia wrote to Darius, telling him of what was doing in Jerusalem, and, as declared by the "chief doers," by virtue of the decree of Cyrus, not of Darius; that these rulers of Syria and Phœnicia thereupon asked for a search to be made among the records of king Cyrus, and if it were found, that the king should signify his pleasure respecting it. He goes on to say, that king Darius accordingly ordered the search to be made; and having found the decree of Cyrus, he confirmed it, and the building was completed. Now this account, as agreeing with that in the book of Ezra, is not only true, but clear on the face of it as referring to the permission of a former monarch. But if the permission had been given by Darius himself to Zerubbabel, as immediately before detailed, what occasion could there have been for any search among the records of Cyrus, when nothing more was necessary than to refer to the permission of Darius, the reigning monarch, which would have been much more conclusive than the decree of his predecessor? Other inconsistencies and self-contradictions might also be pointed out, but these will suffice to show what little reliance can be placed on the authority of this 11th book of the 'Jewish Antiquities.' Yet it is in this same book, which

bears such internal evidence of having been falsified, that we find the assertion made of the main body of the ten tribes having remained beyond the Euphrates, and of only two being then in Asia or Europe, subject to the Romans.

The 11th book may therefore have been interpolated by some of the same sect or parties as those who composed the fables of the Apocryphal Esdras, and who introduced into it the statement of the ten tribes being still remaining in the lands of their captivity. This appears, therefore, the work of a later age, when the Rabbins, mortified at the non-appearance of their expected Messiah as a temporal prince, denied the application of the prophecies to the events that had occurred, and chose to look on them as yet unfulfilled. They would thus connect the advent of their Messiah with the return of the ten tribes, whose captivity they declared had never been loosed; and though they failed in persuading any others of the Christian writers to assent to their assertions, yet we have seen that they succeeded in drawing St. Jerome into this supposition. But St. Jerome was, more than any other of the Christian fathers, attached to the study of the Hebrew writings; and it cannot, therefore, excite any great astonishment in our minds that he gave it too easy a belief. However much it might suit the views of the rabbinical writers to put forward such opinions, it was not consistent with what the other Christian authorities understood of history, to be so ready to adopt them; and it as little, therefore, becomes us in the present day to receive them as unquestionable.

But whatever might have been the origin of this conception, I trust it has been satisfactorily shown, from the arguments adduced, that the main body of the captives, or of their descendants, must have returned to Jerusalem to become united as one nation with that still larger portion of their brethren who had escaped being carried away. At the time they returned, it is probable that some numbers might have remained behind; and, as Josephus wrote full 600 years after Cyrus, it was only to be expected that the descendants of even a small portion left behind would, in such a long space of time, and under perhaps favourable circumstances, have become what he might justly call "an immense multitude, not to be estimated by numbers." Still, according to his version of Agrippa's speech, they were under subjection to the Parthians, and were so according to St. Jerome some 400 years afterwards. When, therefore, we find Josephus writing 600 years, and St. Jerome 1000 years after the events under our consideration, we must remember that they wrote

under the impressions prevalent in their times, which impressions we have it in our power to correct by more ancient, and, what is the highest, by Scriptual authority.

To controvert this assertion of Josephus, that there were in his time but two tribes subject to the Romans, while the other ten were still beyond the Euphrates, we have another writer to refer to, whose authority cannot be denied by the most strenuous admirer of Josephus, inasmuch as the latter quotes him by name, adopts his statements, and, in fact, gives an exact abridgement of his work. This writer has undoubtedly been pronounced an apocryphal one by some learned persons of later times, whose opinion may be admitted to be correct, without invalidating our argument; though I cannot but think that his interesting narrative may be substantially correct, notwithstanding it may be somewhat overstated. The author to whom I allude is Aristeas, or the person who under that name has left a history of the circumstances attending the translation of the Scriptures known by us as the Septuagint. He professes to have taken a prominent part in effecting it; and, except for the sake of magnifying his own merits, or of gratifying Ptolemy Philadelphus, it would be difficult to guess what motives could have induced him to write it, if it be a falsity. It has been said, that his object was to enhance the character of the translation, as if to represent it as made under divine aid; but this is only a construction given to his narrative from the high estimation in which the translation was afterwards held, and not from any statements of his own; while the objections made to them as false, on account of the enormous payments said to have been made by Ptolemy, may easily be explained as dependent upon the value of the money then in circulation in those countries, of which we really have now no knowledge. This work of Aristeas is still extant, and appears to me to possess intrinsic marks of authenticity. If this opinion be correct, the work must have been written about 250 years before our era; and there is not perhaps another ancient work in whose favour so many corroborative testimonies may be adduced. His story we find referred to by Aristobulus, who flourished in the 125th year B. C., and repeated, with additions, by Philo, who was contemporary with our Saviour. As before mentioned, Josephus himself, towards the end of the first century, agrees entirely with Aristeas, whom he quotes by name, and from whom he gives an account, which is in reality nothing more than an abridgement of his original. Justin Martyr, Eusebius, and a number of other ancient Christian writers, have followed in the same track,

adopting his statements implicitly, without any suspicion of their being to be thought fabulous, though some later writers have so discredited them. Whether fabulous or not, our argument will still remain unaffected; but I think it is but due to this author to attempt the vindication of his veracity, impugned upon what may be justly considered assumed and unsatisfactory grounds.

Aristeas states, that Ptolemy Philadelphus, king of Egypt, being intent on forming a great library at Alexandria, and being desirous of getting all manner of books into it, committed the care of this matter to Demetrius Phalereus, a noble Athenian then living in his court, directing him to procure from all nations whatever books were of note among them. Demetrius, pursuant to these orders, having been informed of the book of the Law of Moses among the Jews, acquainted the king of it, who thereupon signified his pleasure that it should be sent for from Jerusalem, with interpreters to render it into Greek, and ordered what was proper to be done to send to the high priest about it. Accordingly, a letter was written in the king's name to Eleazar, the high priest, and messengers were sent with a large sum of money for sacrifices, and costly presents. On the messengers coming to Jerusalem, they were received with great respect by the high priest, and all the people of the Jews, and had all readily granted them that they came to ask. Having then received from the high priest a true copy of the Law of Moses, all written in gold letters, and six elders out of every tribe, that is, seventy-two in all, to make a version of it into Greek, they returned with them to Alexandria. On their arrival, the king, having called those elders to his court, made trial of them by seventy-two questions proposed to them, each one in order; and, from the answers they made, approving of their wisdom, he gave them valuable presents, and lodged them in a house in the island of Pharos, adjoining Alexandria. Here, having agreed in the version of each period by common conference together, in the space of seventy-two days they performed the whole work, when, with further rewards, they were all sent home to their own country.

This, in brief, is the history of Aristeas, which may be all or partly fabulous; though, if so, it would be difficult to imagine what could be the object of the author in inventing it. There is every probability of truth in respect of the statement of Ptolemy's anxiety to procure a translation of the Law of Moses for his renowned library, the formation of which has immortalized his memory, and handed down his name in such honourable contrast to every other monarch of

antiquity. Some of the details, however, may be fables or exaggerations, though, for the purpose of our argument, it is of no consequence whether the whole story be true or false. If true, it proves that some 277 years B. C. there were the twelve tribes in Judæa, in sufficient numbers to have six elders chosen out of each tribe, sufficiently skilled in the Greek language to be able to translate their law into it from their own Hebrew. If the story be not true, it at least proves that in the estimation of the author, who must have lived and written long before our era, and was probably himself of the Jewish nation, there were the twelve tribes then present in Judæa, and that out of each there might have been six elders chosen, sufficiently skilled in Greek to make the translation.

It has already been stated, that Josephus himself, and a vast number of other writers of the earlier ages, Jewish and Christian, received this history implicitly as true. It did not occur to any of them that it must have been a manifest imposture, if it were indeed the fact that there were no twelve tribes in Judæa, but only two, and the other ten on the other side of the Euphrates, or wandered away into some further country. This notable discovery was reserved for the learned Scaliger and later writers, who have curiously enough denied the authenticity of the history of Aristeas upon this very ground, that there were only two tribes at the time in Judæa, and the other ten carried away into Media; so that the story of six elders being chosen out of each tribe could not be true. This, however, as we have before contended, was only reasoning upon an assumption, borrowed, without examination, from rabbinical writers, who denied the fulfilment of prophecies that had taken place, and wished to make it be believed that these, with reference to the ten tribes, were yet to be looked for with the advent of their Messiah. But though this might suit the views of the Rabbins, it was contrary to the belief of all the older Christian writers, who, in every reference to the subject, seem to have had no idea of these ten tribes being lost or absent. Thus it is that Hegesippus, the first and most ancient writer of church history, expressly declares, that it was the custom for all the tribes to come up every year to the Passover, and that it was at one of these anniversaries that St. James, the first bishop of that city, suffered martyrdom. This extract from Hegesippus is preserved by Eusebius, book ii. ch. 23, without any dissent from the statement, and he therefore gives the weight of his authority also to the conclusion that there must have been then more than two tribes only

present in Judæa; while, as before stated, the fact of so many Christian as well as Jewish writers having copied the history of Aristeas without any expression indicating a doubt of its authenticity, must be accepted as evidences in its favour.

In the time of Josephus, which was nearly 400 years after Aristeas, the twelve tribes had no doubt become so amalgamated as to have no distinctions markedly remaining, and he might thus have been led into the erroneous opinion that there were then only two tribes subject to the Romans. It is even possible that the passage in the 11th book, in which he makes this assertion, was the interpolation of some later rabbin, inasmuch as it seems to contradict the former part of the same sentence to which it is attached, and at all events it has been shown, that this very book in which it is contained was the "least considered and the worst digested of all he had written." The same remarks apply also in a great measure to the authority of St. Jerome, whose judgment was not in all cases of the most discriminating character; and even he, in referring to the translation of the Septuagint, not only gives his assent to the history of Aristeas, by repeating it, but tells us that he himself, when in Alexandria, had actually seen the ruins of the seventy-two cells, as he calls them, in which the seventy-two translators, sent from Jerusalem, had been lodged by Ptolemy. His evidence, therefore, in favour of the history of Aristeas cannot but be held as invalidating the opinion he elsewhere expressed of the ten tribes being still subject to the Parthians, and inhabiting in his time the cities and mountains of the Medes.

Beyond the statements of authors, however, but in corroboration of Aristeas, we have still another means of judging of the real facts of this question, in the constitution of the chief civil institution of the Jews of later times, the High Court, or Sanhedrim. It is quite unnecessary to repeat here any of the references on the subject which are to be found in the many popular works on Jewish antiquities, so easily accessible to every reader. Without entering, therefore, into the arguments respecting the origin of this court, it will be sufficient to express an opinion, that those writers appear best to be followed who held it to have risen into power in the time of the Maccabees, or within 200 years before our era. The theory of this court was, that it should consist of six elders out of each tribe, except Levi, which only sent four, making seventy in all, conformably to the council which Moses had formed for his assistance; and as Moses or Aaron, who were of the tribe of Levi, had to preside in all matters of importance, so the high priest, or his coadjutor, presided

in later times, to give Levi an equal weight with the other tribes. It is most probable, that the course was not strictly followed of having precisely six out of each tribe in the Sanhedrim. But the circumstance of the members being so supposed elected representing the twelve tribes, must be pronounced a convincing proof of their being all considered present in the country from which they might be chosen. Thus they became judges of the whole nation, not of two or three tribes only; and thus St. Peter, when brought before the court, could justly address them as "rulers of the people, and elders of Israel."

In later times, the distinction of tribes and the registration of genealogies grew gradually but completely out of consideration. The sacerdotal race must necessarily be expected to have attended to them the longest; and some individuals may thus, even in the present day, be enabled to declare themselves of the tribe of Levi. The next tribe that seems longest to have kept up their distinctive character was, unfortunately for the advocates of the Afghan theory', that of Simeon. Of this tribe chiefly — as we have direct statements of the Jewish writers themselves, quoted in all the works on the subject — were the Scribes, a numerous and powerful body in the time of our Saviour, comprising the lawyers, copyists, and expounders of the law and other teachers. (Jenning's Jewish Antiquities, i. p. 313; Tomline's Elements, vol. i. p. 244.) Of the other tribes we have only a few individual notices: Anna, the daughter of Phanuel, of the tribe of Aser, and St. Paul of Benjamin, besides the Levites and Judah. In the present day, no one can show himself to be of the tribe of Judah even, or of Benjamin, which tribes, therefore, have become immerged in the general body as completely as the others.

Having already referred to the interesting work of the American Missionary, Grant, 'Nestorians, or the Lost Tribes,' it will not be out of place here to refer to it in detailing some other conclusions deducible from the foregoing considerations. From the statements in this work, it appears unquestionable that the Nestorians whom he visited were of Israelitish descent, not only from their traditions, their patronymic appellations and general appearance, but, what is much more important in the question, from their language, their rites and institutions, and their peculiar manners and customs agreeing with those of the professed Jews in their neighbourhood, by whom also they were acknowledged to be of kindred descent. But the excellent missionary has proved too much for his supposition of their being descendants of

the Assyrian captives; for, as with regard to the strictness of their accordance with the Mosaic ritual, he forgets that the Assyrian captives had revolted from its observance for many generations previous to the captivity, when, if they had not returned to their own land, they could not possibly be supposed likely to have attained to it again. Many of those stricter observances, also, grew into use only after the return from Babylon, so that the fact of their possessing them is in reality a proof of their being descendants of those who had, after that return, given a stricter obedience to the Mosaic law than their fathers had done.

Again, with regard to their language, which he states to be Syriac, the same as that used by the Jews in their neighbourhood, we must remember that this was the language of Judæa in the time of our Saviour, and we have therefore much more reason from this to conclude, that they are descendants of the Christianized Jews, to whom St. James addressed his Epistle, than descendants of the Israelites taken away by the Assyrians. These, in the course of so many centuries, may certainly be presumed to have adopted the language of their masters, the Medes and Persians, as their brethren in Babylon adopted that of the Chaldees. If these, then, in seventy years, forgot the use of their language, as we know they did, to learn the language of their masters, we must presume that their brethren, who had exceeded them so long in captivity, would have adopted the language of their conquerors also, which language was very different from the one in use in Judæa after the restoration.

We must not forget that the Assyrians, in taking away their captives, took them away not as distinct independent people, but as slaves, whether individually or in families. We cannot suppose that these slaves would ever have been allowed the free exercise of their own institutions, but rather that they would have been compelled to submit to those of their masters. When, therefore, the permission was given by Cyrus and his successors to all of the race of Israel to return, it was in fact a manumission and a boon of which they would be glad to avail themselves. In proportion as they felt the bondage of the heathen galling in their captivity, they would be anxious to return to their own land. If any of them preferred remaining in the land of their captivity, we may presume it would be from a willingness to succumb to the customs of the heathen, in accordance with the proneness to idolatry they had always shown. In so doing, they would thus, in every succeeding generation, retain less and less knowledge of their ancient law, until at length

they became absorbed among the nations with whom they dwelt. They would then become lost in becoming heathens, and so may now be followers of Mahomet, as are the Afghans. This, however, would be inconsistent with the story told in Esdras, of their being disgusted with the practices of the heathen, so as to resolve to go into a further country to avoid them. Those who felt any such desire to return to the pure worship of their fathers, had the best means afforded them to do so by returning to their own land, and not by wandering into unknown regions. We may therefore conclude, from all these motives influencing their conduct, that the great majority of the captives, or of their descendants, actually returned to Judæa, rather than remain in the countries whither they had been led captive.

The different colonies of Jews found in India and other parts of Asia have generally a tradition, that they are descendants of the inhabitants of Jerusalem and Judæa, driven away by the Romans. But the very fact of their acknowledging the appellation of Jews, proves that they could not be descendants of the ten tribes, to whom that name could never have been applied. It was only in later times, when all the tribes had become associated together in Judæa, they obtained the general appellation of Jews as inhabitants of that country; and thus their descendants throughout the East may justly continue to hold it as appropriately as do their brethren in Europe. If, however, there be any considerable number of their race in Asia, as has been asserted, who ignore the name of Jews, and who style themselves Israelites, still this could not be any solid reason to conclude that they were necessarily descendants of the ten tribes taken away captive. We have shown, that in the time of Ezra the restored people were generally known by the name of Israelites, which name was also in general use in the time of the Maccabees, and even still later, in the time of our Saviour, so that the latest migrations of the nation might have had some families among them acknowledging the name of Israelites only, who would consequently leave that of Jews unknown to their descendants.

Various accounts have been from time to time transmitted us of people existing in different countries, some for instance in Malabar, and some in China, who profess to be Israelites, and who, possessing many Israelitish characteristics, have been thereupon supposed to be descendants of the ten tribes. These accounts however are so vague, that, with every desire to acknowledge the good faith of the narrators, we cannot accept all their statements without more satisfactory evidence

than the second-hand reports they have given; especially as many of these reports themselves carry with them a confutation of the conclusions in support of which they are adduced. Some of these people are said to possess copies of the Scriptures, which copies however are not brought forward for due examination, and of which, as we can only judge by conjecture, there may be doubts as to their value. In the reign of Josiah, which was a hundred years after the Assyrian captivity, we know that the Scriptures had become almost lost, so that when a copy had been found by some chance in the temple, it was received with a reverence and dread, showing how much they had been neglected. If this occurrence took place in Jerusalem, in the head-quarters of their religion, how can we suppose that the rebellious idolaters of the ten tribes would have been more careful of their preservation through the centuries of their revolt, and through upwards of 2000 years that have elapsed since they were scattered among the heathen? If the Israelites then did actually possess copies of their law, they would of course also possess them in their original character, which was akin to the Samaritan, and not to the Hebrew, as we now know it. But the Scriptures among these Indian and Chinese Israelites are described as Hebrew, and if this be true, and if they really preserve any Jewish ritual or Jewish institutions, or other customs, we may rather conclude them to be descendants of some Jewish colonies or families of much later migration, than descendants of the captives taken away by the Assyrians.

If however no ground could be alleged for suspecting that these scattered families of the Israelitish people must have been necessarily offsets from Judæa, of a date posterior to the restoration, and if stronger grounds could be adduced than we have yet heard, of any of them having arrived at their locations at an earlier period, still the utmost that could even then be allowed in such case is, that they were descendants from some individual families of the ten tribes who had escaped from captivity, but were not substantially representatives of the tribes themselves. We are not informed that they are anywhere to be found in any very considerable numbers; but if they were so found in tenfold proportions to any reported, yet still those numbers would not be so great as might be expected, if only a few families, in the natural increase of population during the 2500 years and upwards that have elapsed since the Assyrian captivity.

The conclusions deducible from the foregoing considerations may finally be summed up in the following recapitulation: —

I. That the numbers of those taken away in the different captivities have been much over-estimated; for that only the principal people were taken as hostages, with the men of war and others most available as slaves.

II. That the main body of the ten tribes cannot be supposed to have been taken away, but left in their ancient possessions, when they became subjected again to the kings of Judah.

III. That the only tribes that can be supposed to have been taken away in any considerable body with regard to their relative numbers, were the Reubenites, the Gadites, and the half-tribe of Manasseh, and that of Naphthali, who being located in the open plains on the north and on the east side of the Jordan, were the first and most exposed to the attacks of their enemies; while the other tribes, living in a more hilly country, were not so easily overpowered. The above-named tribes also having lived more contiguous to the heathen, probably yielded most to their customs, and thus when taken away among their conquerors, have become most absorbed amongst them.

IV. That the greater part of those who had been taken away to Babylon, or their descendants, and the greater part of the descendants of those taken away by the Assyrians returned to their ancient habitations, as it was their advantage to do so, to become free rather than remain bondsmen in a foreign country; though as it is probable that the proportion of males carried away far exceeded that of the females, the descendants of the Assyrian captives might not have amounted to so great a number as that of the captives originally.

V. That while in Babylonia, Assyria, and other countries of their conquerors, they cannot be supposed to have lived apart by their tribes, as in their native land; so that in the course of the 209 years and upwards which elapsed between their captivity and the first year of Cyrus, those taken away by the Assyrians must have lost all distinction of tribes, and become prepared to form part of that restored nation which obtained the name of Jews from the principal tribe among them.

VI. That the tribe of Judah having been the most numerous, and their city of Jerusalem the centre round which the Israelites congregated, it follows as a natural consequence, that their name became the prevailing one for their nation, though composed of different tribes; the same as the English and other nations have obtained a national appellation from that of the principal people among them, though in fact originally composed of different races.

VII. That the amalgamation, or union into one people, of all the Israelites, was in strict accordance with the predictions of the prophets, declared by Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and others; which predictions, all their subsequent history shows to have been then fulfilled.

VIII. That the remnant of the Israelites left in Babylonia and Assyria, though smaller in number than that portion of them gathered together in Judæa under the favour of Cyrus and his successors, might yet have increased to an immense multitude in the 600 years which elapsed between the first restoration and the time of Josephus, as their fathers did in the 430 years of their sojourning in Egypt. But that the descendants of that remnant left beyond the Euphrates cannot properly be considered as representing the ten tribes, and much less to have been the entire body of the ten tribes, as Josephus calls them, inasmuch as the principal portion of them had returned to Judæa and become united with that still greater portion of all the tribes which had all along remained in Judæa and the neighbouring districts.

IX. That in the time of Josephus all distinctions of the other tribes having become lost, except those of Judah, Benjamin, and Levi, he erroneously supposed they were the only tribes that had returned, and that the other ten tribes all still remained beyond the Euphrates; for that even if the authority of Josephus were higher than it is, and unquestioned in this part of his book, still we have other weightier evidence to the contrary, and the unexceptionable testimony of Scripture.

X. That in any case the dream of Esdras respecting the ten tribes "having taken counsel among themselves and having gone into a further country where never mankind dwelt," was a mere dream, unsubstantiated by any corroborative consideration whatever, and in fact, as Prideaux says of the eleventh book of Josephus, "contrary to Scripture, to history, and to common sense," with which dream therefore all the theories founded upon it must be classed.

If the above conclusions, and the arguments upon which they are founded, be correct, it follows that the supposition of there being any people now existing as a separate people representing the ten tribes is a groundless hallucination, unworthy of the times in which it has obtained so extensive a credence.

APPENDIX.

I. — ON THE SIX DAYS OF THE CREATION.

The mistaken translation of the Hebrew word יום yom, as "day" in our version has been peculiarly unfortunate in imbuing the generality of readers with an almost ineradicable impression that the periods of time referred to in the sacred narrative consisted merely of ordinary days, such as we now experience them, of twenty-four hours each. When, therefore, our geologists show us that this globe has evidently passed through a number of mutations, involving many long periods of time previous to its being rendered fit for the habitation of beings constituted as we are, such readers are unable to perceive that the sacred historian actually declared the same fact as occurring in the six periods to which his narrative refers.

Reason on this point would show us, that though the fiat of the Creator might unquestionably have called the whole creation into existence in a moment, as well as in one day or six days, yet that such instantaneous operations are not in accordance with the course of action which the Almighty is pleased to adopt in the ordinance of the world. Our daily experience shows us, that in the smallest items of creation, — in the growth of a shrub or the life of an insect, — a length of time is proportioned to the objects intended; and the slightest reflection would argue, that it was little consistent with the loftiness of Him who inhabiteth eternity, to suppose He would set Himself to the great creation of worlds as if to do a stated task within a stated limit of only a few hours' duration.

Dr. Buckland, in his "Bridgewater Treatise," though acknowledging, on the authority of the Hebrew professor Dr. Pusey, that "There is no sound critical or theological objection to the interpretation of the word 'day' as meaning a long period of time," seems as if he could not for one divest himself of the prevailing prejudice on the subject. Thus he suggests, by way of reconciling the error with the fact, that the changes obser-

vable in the body of the earth might perhaps have occurred in the period designated as the "beginning," which he supposes to have been a period altogether prior to the six days of creation, and one that might have extended over millions of years. This concession, however, to a mistaken notion is unworthy of the learned Dean's character as a philosopher, as being in itself totally untenable. The word translated "day" is constantly used throughout the Scriptures as applied to indefinite periods of time (Prideaux, Connexion, &c., sub anno A. C. 428), and the clear meaning of the first and second verses of the first chapter of Genesis shows, that the period indicated comprehended part of the first age, or day of the world.

The more scrutinously we look into the exact interpretation of the Hebrew text, the more delighted we find ourselves to observe how beautifully exact was the information conveyed, as suited either to the limited ideas of former times, or the more accurate researches of modern science. Thus, in the original we find it stated, that in the beginning God created not simply "the heavens and the earth," but, as Bellamy has more correctly rendered it, "the substance of the heavens and the substance of the earth." (The Holy Bible, newly translated, by John Bellamy, 1818.) The word אֵת, *eth*, twice repeated in this verse, should, as he justly argues, be thus translated; and as he had no theory to indulge in with regard to this passage, as he had upon too many other parts of the Mosaic history, there may be the less hesitation in accepting his version of it. It is certain that this word must be similarly interpreted in other parts of the Scriptures; and as in regard to this passage he states he has the authority of the Syriac version, and also of the Paraphrase of Onkelos, both of the highest character, in his favour, there cannot be any reasonable doubt on the subject. The earlier Hebraists not having rightly understood the meaning of the word, have endeavoured to explain it as a sign of the accusative case. This acceptation of it, however, in the present instance, Bellamy controverts, for reasons into which it is unnecessary now to enter; the only object here being, to show the expediency of reading the original Hebrew by the light of modern knowledge, and so learn the wonderful provision made in it to meet the understandings of all ages. The phrase by this light may receive its true meaning, and guide us to the equally significant value of other passages, in which it is passed over by Bellamy himself, as well as in our other versions. The passages more particularly referred to, among others, are those in which it is stated that "God made two great lights;" and again, "God formed man of the dust of the ground." The latter was perhaps paraphrased in the Apo-

crypha, "Thou gavest a body unto Adam without living soul, and didst breathe into him the breath of life, and he was made living before Thee." (2 Esdras, III. 5.) I presume to think, that the word אֵת should be more generally considered a substantive word, which whether necessarily to be translated or not, has nevertheless its substantive signification.

Returning to the consideration of the six periods of the world's mutations, it is interesting to observe how many traces of true history are to be found in the earliest traditions of mankind, in opposition to modern prejudices. The Persians, as Bellamy has stated at length, had a distinct and particular recognition of those six periods; and he might have added, so had the Etruscans also, as we are informed by Suidas (*voce* Tyrrhenia). The latter, as a Lydian colony, were, it may be presumed, a cognate people to the Phœnicians, and these being conterminous to the Israelites on the one side, as the Persians were on the other, may well all be supposed to have derived their traditions from authentic sources, which may so be entitled to be quoted as confirmatory of our argument. Bearing this in mind, we may perceive the beautiful precision of the communication given us by Moses, of the substance, or nucleus of the earth having been created in the "beginning," the first period of its existence. It was then that, floating through space in an uncertain orbit, perhaps as a comet, this globe had, in its several primary states or periods, to have its fluid compounds gathered together in due order, the atmosphere regulated, and the dry land emerged and fitted to produce the rank herb suitable to its condition. It had then to enter on another important stage of the work of creation: to be placed under the influence or attraction of that orb which we now recognize as the centre of our system, beginning then to revolve around it so as to form our days and nights, by periodical evolutions. This, we are informed, was on the fourth æra, or day, of the world; and this consideration alone shows the impossibility of our ordinary days of twenty-four hours, as we call them, being intended in the sacred narrative: inasmuch as these alternations of time only commenced at so late a period of the creation.

The Hebrew text does not state that the greater and lesser lights were then created; but made, or caused, to rule the day and night, "for signs and for seasons, and for days and years." In like manner with our globe, they had no doubt an immeasurable prior existence; but it was then their present relative courses began to form this planet a part of the system such as we find it. The rank produce of the earth under the anterior period would now become enriched to a finer vegetation under the genial influence of the sun and the planet be prepared for

the further development of creation of the fifth period. This, as suited to the yet incomplete condition of the earth, at first consisted only of fishes, and birds, and aquatic animals, the last often of great size, as fitted to range over the immense plains and marshes of the new-formed world, until, at a subsequent period, it became gradually fitted to receive creatures of a higher nature or organization, ending finally in the creation of man.

By analogy, then, from the leisurely course pursued with regard to the minutest works of nature under our constant observation, we might have concluded that the great works of creation had not been conducted on any different principle. Surely it is a thought derogatory to the Deity, that this wonderful creation should have been hurried into being as if it were only the work of men's hands, for mere mortal purposes. This consideration alone might have led the translators to reflect, that as large an interpretation ought to be given to the word יום in this passage as was found necessary to be given to it in any other part of the Scriptures; and if the mistake cannot be entirely rectified in the present day, some means at least should be adopted to obviate the consequences. If any inconveniences might be supposed to arise from an entire revision being ordered of our version of the Scriptures, some remedy might be found by the insertion in the margins of all future editions of the correct meaning of the original, in the many cases existing where misapprehensions must otherwise continue to prevail. It is certainly much to be lamented, that explanations on such, and so many points should be required; but the necessity is apparent when we find even men of great learning, in works of authority, succumbing to prejudices arising from this and other like misconceptions.

II. — ON THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE WORLD.

Another error which has taken a deep and apparently almost an ineradicable possession of the public mind, is that respecting the age of the world, or rather the period of time that has elapsed since the creation of man. Dr. Buckland, in the work already mentioned, refers to this period as of about 6000 years, in conformity with the common computation found in our version of the Scriptures, and adopted in almost every edition of them, so as to promulgate the error every day more widely. It would be an endless task to enumerate the authors who

have, even in the present day, repeated this error, notwithstanding the labours of Dr. Hales, Bishop Russell, and others, who have so satisfactorily refuted it. Referring to these eminent writers for a full exposition of the correct dates, it is unnecessary here, in the sequel of this work, to enter into the subject further than to advert to their conclusions. From these it results, that the period which had elapsed between the creation of man and the advent of our Saviour, was of about 5500 years. With these conclusions I presume to differ only so far as to believe that it should have been estimated several centuries longer. Some of the best authorities cited by Bishop Russell, in his excellent work on the "Connection of Sacred and Profane History," such as St. Cyprian, Origen, Ambrose and others (vol. I. p. 113), declare the age of the world at the advent to have been nearer 6000 years. Beyond these, a due consideration of the events narrated in the Mosaic history will show, that the respected chronologists above mentioned have not allowed sufficient time for several important periods; as, for instance, that of the Israelites sojourning in Egypt. For this period they have allowed only 250 years instead of 430, for which they might have reasonably adopted the statements bearing that construction rather than the other. Conformably also with the probabilities of the case, the weight of authority seems to be in favour of the longer period; for we cannot in reason suppose the family of Jacob, consisting of about 150 souls when entering Egypt, to have increased, in less than about 400 years, to the numbers detailed of the twelve tribes at the exode, according to ordinary rules. We have no ground to suppose that their numbers were increased by proselytism or other extraordinary means, so that the slightest consideration of the experience we have of this question will suffice to show which estimate should be adopted. Difficulties may be suggested on both sides; but where authorities differ, we are warranted in adopting the conclusion supported also by the laws of Nature, as most consistent with reason.

These questions, however, are here only incidentally referred to, in exemplification of the assertions made in this work of prevailing errors, which require repeated confutation. Notwithstanding the labours of the learned chronologists above mentioned, the errors they have refuted continue to be repeated in new editions of the Scriptures, so as to render it necessary for every opportunity to be taken of calling for their correction. It is little creditable to this age to have writers, eminent by their position and abilities, assenting so constantly, as we find them doing, to an exploded system of chronology as if it were unquestionable. But the evil is still greater when we find others,

either from ignorance or design, practising on the credulity of their readers, or listeners, with absurd speculations on the approaching termination of the world's existence, on the credit of such a system, and the traditions connected with it. Such practices we find too frequently prevailing, and we cannot too strongly urge their correction.

From analogy, we may certainly recognize the probability of the theory, that as this planet has manifestly undergone many changes, through unknown ages, to fit it for the habitation of different races of beings who have passed over it, so it may yet be destined to undergo others, to fit it for the occupation of a still higher class of beings than ourselves, in accordance also with what is intimated in the Scriptures. At the same time, it is contrary to reason to suppose, that such a consummation could have been ordained to take place in so short a period as has yet been allotted to our race. We may therefore conclude, that many ages may yet elapse before any further change shall occur, as many prophecies have yet to be fulfilled, and much progress to be made towards the perfectibility of our nature. At any rate, the common fallacy of the approaching consummation of all things at the end of the present thousand years, as the completion of the term of 6000 years for which the world has been supposed to have been created, may be denounced as utterly groundless. It was as prevalent at the time of the Apostles as it is in some quarters at present, and perhaps is as far from accomplishment now as it has proved to have been in the interval since then. The dreaded completion of the term of 6000 years of the world's existence has certainly long since passed by, and all present speculations respecting it may be unhesitatingly pronounced to be as futile now as the past have been.

When, however, we find such prepossessions prevailing, we cannot insist too strongly on every means being taken to ensure their correction. This can only be effected by the extension of knowledge, and the freest discussion of every question, which, if honestly entered into, cannot but be conducive to the interests of truth.

NOTE I.

RESPECTING THE BASQUES.

In the preceding essays (pp. 22—25. 6, and 160—161) reference is made to the Basques. It is stated that some Language of which the Biscayan is the modern representative has contributed words to Latin, Italian, Spanish and English; and in the latter case (pp. 160—161) examples are given. It is further stated that several Spanish writers endeavour to explain by means of the Biscayan Language the ancient inscriptions which have been found in different parts of Spain, and that the Author would have attempted to interpret Etruscan inscriptions by that language; and to prove that the Basques are the descendants of an Eastern Colony in the North of Spain. Unfortunately the arguments by which this view of the case was to have been maintained were not written; but Caria is the country from whence the origin of the Basques was to have been traced, and their own national appellation "Euscaldunac", and the name which they give to their language "Euscara" would have been cited in corroboration. Two curious coincidences are to be found in Drummond's Origines which may be quoted in support of this theory of an Eastern origin for the Basque people and language. "The Syrians called the Idol of the Moon 'Adera-Daga', the splendid fish (I. p. 49). In Biscayan *Ederra* means fine, handsome. Again, speaking of the Phœnicians and Syrians, Drummond says, "in whose dialect Amah or Amma signifies the mother" (III. p. 213). *Ama* is Biscayan for the mother.

The structure of the Biscayan language is very peculiar. The nouns are simple, and are in many cases obviously derived from particles in that language, the compound meaning of which gives the exact signification of the noun. The verbs admit of inflections which show conclusively that it was once spoken by a people amongst whom the different ranks of society were strongly marked. The internal evidence thus

afforded proves that the Biscayan language is one of extreme antiquity, and that it was the speech of a people living in a highly artificial state of civilization.

There are no traditions which reach to a more ancient era than the time of Charlemagne. Larrategui indeed in his work entitled "Epitome de los Señores de bizcaya" gives the names of the immediate descendants of Tubal the son of Japhet the first Lords of Biscay; but neither he or any other writers give any details which can be critically considered worthy of notice until after the expedition of Charlemagne.

It is true that none of the Biscayan writers allege any such Eastern origin for their nation; they rather seek to show that their ancestors once possessed the whole of Spain, and were afterwards driven into the mountains of Biscay in the same manner as the Welsh are the descendants of the ancient Britons who were driven into Wales. It can however scarcely be doubted that great exaggeration has taken place in the attempts which have been made to prove an identity between ancient Spanish names of cities and inscriptions, and the modern Biscayan language; but to whatever extent they may be considered well founded, as these are mostly found on the coast and in many cases in places to which a Phœnician or Carthaginian origin is to be assigned, the result is favourable to the line of argument which it is here sought to advocate; the several localities in question and the mining-country of Biscay having probably received colonies of kindred origin from the Eastern shores of the Mediterranean. In conclusion it is right to state that there does not appear to be any trace of Eastern words in connection with religious services, but there seems to be some reference to the worship of Astarté in the names of the days of the week, which are now spelt in the following manner.

Igandea	Sunday
Astelena	Monday
Asteartea	Tuesday
Asteazquena	Wednesday
Osteguna	Thursday
Osterala	Friday
Lanunbata	Saturday

C. M. K.

NOTE II.

RESPECTING THE TRACES OF PHŒNICIAN COLONIZATION TO BE FOUND IN CENTRAL AMERICA.

Among the theories which were put forward after the discovery of America by Columbus respecting the part of the old world from whence the Nations which were found there had originally come, was one which maintained that traces of a Phœnician influence were to be met with. Horne in his work 'de originibus Americanis', and Calmet in his Dissertation on the Hebrews held this view, and the grounds which they give in support of it are worthy of more attention than they have received of late years. To enter into their line of argument would oblige me to exceed the space which can here be properly given to the subject, but the result sought to be arrived at will be nearly the same. I shall endeavour to show that the references to lands beyond the Atlantic to be met with in the classics are so precise and to be found in so many writers of different times, that they cannot in critical fairness be regarded as visionary fancies mixed up with the results of scientific or historical researches: and then that the remains of ancient cities still existing in Central America, as well as certain customs of the former inhabitants afford a probability, approaching as nearly to certainty as we could expect, that a people who in ancient times inhabited the shores of the Mediterranean made voyages to Yucatan and the neighbouring islands.

The jealousy which the Nations of the more remote ages of antiquity always evinced in regard to all matters that concerned their colonies, a feeling not yet quite extinct, is sufficient reason to account for the scanty notices to be met with in the classics. The original records of voyages beyond the Pillars of Hercules were written in the Phœnician or some kindred language, and even if these had been made public, some at least must be supposed to have perished in the political convulsions which had taken place before the time of Herodotus. The Greeks were not disposed to believe anything which they could not thoroughly understand; and if so well attested an event as the circumnavigation of Africa in the reign of Pharaoh Necho was discredited because the sun was reported to assume a different position towards the spectator on opposite sides of the equator, we cannot wonder that accounts of lands inhabited by human beings beyond the Atlantic should be re-

ceived with doubt. For their mythology taught that beyond the Ocean lay the Elysian fields, the regions of the Blest:

ὅθι ξανθὸς Ῥαδάμανθος
τῆπερ ῥηΐστη βιοτὴ πέλει ἀνθρώποισιν.
οὐ νιφετὸς οὔτ' ἄρ χειμὼν πολύς, οὔτε ποτ' ὄμβρος,
ἀλλ' αἰεὶ ζεφύροιο λιγὺ πνείοντος ἀήτας
Ὠκεανὸς ἀνίησιν, ἀναψύχειν ἀνθρώπους.

Odys. IV. 564—8.

"The blissful plains
Of utmost earth where Rhadamanthus reigns.
Joys ever young, unmixed with pain or fear,
Fill the wide circle of th' eternal year:
Stern winter smiles on that auspicious clime:
The fields are florid with unfading prime,
From the bleak pole no winds inclement blow,
Mould the round hail, or flake the fleecy snow,
But from the breezy deep the blest inhale
The fragrant murmurs of the western gale."

The ideas which Greek mythology thus associated with the west were very different from those connected with the other extremities of the world, and bear a striking resemblance to the accounts given by the first Spanish discoveries. Greek mythology was in a great measure a system founded on events which had taken place in the earliest ages of the world, the recollection of which was imperfectly handed down to later times; and in this instance the popular belief actually was that land did exist beyond the Atlantic, and that Ocean was not a boundless expanse of sea.

The statement given by Plato in the Timæus is generally treated as if it was altogether unsupported by the testimony of any other writer. But it will be shown that this is not the case. The passage is as follows,

τότε γὰρ πορεύσιμον ἦν τὸ ἐκεῖ πέλαγος· νῆσον γὰρ πρὸ τοῦ στόματος εἶχεν, ὃ καλεῖτε, ὥς φατε ὑμεῖς, Ἡρακλέους στήλας. ἡ δὲ νῆσος ἅμα Λιβύης ἦν καὶ Ἀσίας μείζων, ἐξ ἧς ἐπιβατὸν ἐπὶ τὰς ἄλλας νήσους τοῖς τότ' ἐγίγνετο πορευομένοις. ἐκ δὲ τῶν νήσων ἐπὶ τὴν καταντικρὺ πᾶσαν ἠπειρον τὴν περὶ τὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκεῖνον πόντον. τάδε μὲν γὰρ ὅσα ἐντὸς τοῦ στόματος οὗ λέγομεν φαίνεται λιμὴν στενόν τινα ἔχων εἴσπλουν. ἐκεῖνο δὲ πέλαγος ὄντως ἥ τε περιέχουσα αὐτό γῆ παντελῶς ἀληθῶς, ὀρθότατ' ἂν λέγοιτο ἤπειρος.

Platonis Timæus.

"For at that time the sea in those parts was navigable; for it had an island before its mouth which you call 'Hercules' Pillars', and the island was larger than Africa and Asia together, and from it there was access to the other islands for the men of that time in their journeyings, and from the islands to the whole opposite (*literally* directly opposite) continent that

borders on the true sea. For that which is within the mouth of which we speak, is apparently a harbour with a narrow entrance; but that [which is beyond] a "sea" in reality, and the land that surrounds it would with absolute truth most correctly be called continent." Plato then goes on to say that a great convulsion destroyed this island together with part of Europe, but this passage is valuable as stating expressly that this "true sea" had land surrounding it, or at all events lying around it, which in the state of positive geographical knowledge then possessed as to the outlines of Africa and Europe could not possibly have been said with regard to those parts of the world. Proclus in his commentary on this passage quotes as follows from the History of Ethiopia by Marcellus, "That such and so great an island formerly existed is recorded by some of the historians who have treated of the concerns of the outward sea." (Cory's fragments p. 223.)

We owe to Aristotle the knowledge of many particulars respecting to the Carthaginians, and he may undoubtedly be considered well informed on all matters connected with the affairs of that People. In his treatise De Mirabilibus the following remarkable passage occurs.

Ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ τῇ ἔξω Ἡρακλείων στηλῶν, φασὶν ὑπὸ Καρχηδονίων νῆσον εὑρεθῆναι ἐρήμην, ἔχουσαν ὑλην τε παντοδαπὴν, καὶ ποταμοὺς πλωτοὺς, καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς καρποῖς θαυμαστὴν, ἀπέχουσαν δὲ πλειόνων ἡμερῶν· ἐν ᾗ ἐπιμισγομένων τῶν Καρχηδονίων πλεονάκις, διὰ τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν ἐνίων γε μὴν καὶ οἰκούντων, τοὺς προεστῶτας τῶν Καρχηδονίων ἀπείπασθαι θανάτῳ ζημιοῦν τοὺς εἰς αὐτὴν πλευσομένους, καὶ τοὺς ἐνοικοῦντας πάντας ἀφανίσαι, ἵνα μὴ διαγγέλλωσι, μηδὲ πλῆθος συστραφὲν ἐπ' αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὴν νῆσον κυρίας τύχῃ, καὶ τὴν τῶν Καρχηδονίων εὐδαιμονίαν ἀφέληται.

"It is reported that in the sea beyond the Pillars of Hercules the Carthaginians discovered a desert Island distant many days sail, containing all sorts of wood, navigable rivers and remarkable for diversities of fruits. The Carthaginians the more often resorted thither on account of its resources, going and settling there; whereupon the Carthaginian senate prohibited such voyages under penalty of death, and drove away those who dwelt there, lest information being obtained, others should combine against them for the possession of the Island, and the prosperity of the Carthaginians be taken away."

Plutarch in his Life of Sertorius says that Sertorius about the year 88 B. C. met with some sailors who had just returned from the Atlantic Islands distant 10,000 stadia from Africa. These men are stated to have given such a favorable description of the Islands that Sertorius thought of retiring thither.

The most detailed information which we possess is given by Diodorus Siculus, and it must be remembered that he had access to many sources of information relating to Carthaginian affairs which are now lost, and as a Sicilian would have enjoyed particular advantages in this respect. The following passage is taken from Booth's translation and forms the first part of the 2nd chapter of the 5th Book.

"Since we have gone through the islands lying eastward, on this side within the Pillars of Hercules, we shall now launch into the main ocean to those that lie beyond them; for over against Africa lies a very great island in the vast ocean, of many days sail from Libya, westward. The soil here is very fruitful, a great part whereof is mountainous but much likewise champaign, which is the most sweet and pleasant part of all the rest, for it is watered with several navigable rivers, beautified with many gardens of pleasure, planted with divers sorts of trees, and abundance of orchards, interlaced with currents of sweet water. The towns are adorned with stately buildings, and banquetting houses up and down, pleasantly situated in their gardens and orchards. And here they recreate themselves in summer time, as in places accommodated for pleasure and delight. The mountainous part of the country is clothed with many large woods, and all manner of fruit-trees; and for the greater delight and diversion of people in these mountains, they ever and anon open themselves into pleasant vales, watered with fountains and refreshing springs. And indeed the whole Island abounds with springs of sweet water; whence the inhabitants not only reap pleasure and delight, but improve in wealth and strength of body. There you may have game enough in hunting all sorts of wild beasts of which there is such plenty, that in their feasts there is nothing wanting as to pomp or delight. The adjoining sea furnishes them plentifully with fish for the ocean there naturally abounds with all sorts. The air and climate in this island is very mild and healthful, so that the trees bear fruit (and other things that are produced there, are fresh and beautiful) most part of the year, so that this island for the excellency of it in all respects seems rather to be the residence of some of the gods, than of men; anciently by reason of its remote situation, it was altogether unknown, but afterwards discovered upon this occasion."

"The Phœnicians in ancient times undertook frequent voyages by sea in way of traffic as merchants, so that they planted many colonies both in Africa and in the Western parts of Europe. These merchants succeeding in their undertaking, and thereupon growing very rich, passed at length beyond

the Pillars of Hercules into the sea called the ocean. And first they built a city called Gades near to Hercules' Pillars, at the sea side, in an isthmus in Europe; in which among other things proper for the place, they built a stately temple to Hercules, and instituted splendid sacrifices to be offered to him after the rites and customs of the Phœnicians; this temple is in great veneration at this day, as well as in former ages; so that many of the Romans famous and renowned both for their births and glorious actions, have made their vows to this god, and after success in their affairs have faithfully performed them. The Phœnicians therefore upon the account before related, having found out the coast beyond the Pillars, and sailing along by the shore of Africa, were on a sudden driven by a furious storm afar off into the main ocean, and after they had lain under this violent tempest for many days, they at length arrived at this island, and so coming to the knowledge of the nature and pleasantness of this isle they were the first that discovered it to others: and therefore the Etrurians (when they were masters at sea) designed to send a colony thither, but the Carthaginians opposed them both fearing lest most of their own citizens should be allured through the goodness of the island to settle there, and likewise intending to keep it as a place of refuge for themselves, in case of any sudden and unexpected blasts of fortune, which might tend to the utter ruin of their government. For being then potent at sea, they doubted not but they could easily unknown to the conquerors transport themselves and their families into that island."

This passage is generally interpreted as referring to Madeira, but the statements contained in it show that it cannot have been so intended, and further when Diodorus proceeds immediately after to speak of Britain, he merely states it to be an Island, not a large Island, evidently considering it small compared with the one which he had been describing, whereas it is considerably larger than Madeira. The navigable rivers mentioned by Diodorus, as well as by Aristotle in the passage quoted above, show that a large country was referred to, and do not apply to any of the Atlantic groups or even to the West Indian Islands. Strabo merely quotes the account given by Plato.

Such then are the references to lands beyond the Atlantic to be found in the classics, and found as they are in the writings of authors whose statements respecting other matters are received with deference, it seems to me to be a want of critical fairness to pass them over as undeserving of serious attention merely because they are contrary to our preconceived ideas. I cannot but regard them as independent testimonies

of a knowledge once obtained, but so jealously guarded that only a few vague particulars became known.

The fabulous stories which were spread abroad respecting the dangers of the navigation to the British Islands, to deter interlopers from venturing thither to interfere with the traffic of the Phœnicians and Carthaginians, shows what we may look for in other quarters. Nor was this feeling of jealousy merely a state policy on the part of the government, it entered into the every day life of each member of the state, and the account given by Strabo of the Phœnician galley which was run on a shoal to lead a pursuing foreign vessel to destruction, is as instance of the feeling which would exist in the state of society at that time.

A general decline of maritime enterprise marked the period of Roman supremacy, and no information bearing on this subject is afforded by any Roman Authors whose works are extant. Seneca indeed may have had some of the foregoing passages in view when he wrote the well known lines:

Venient annis
Secula seris, quibus oceanus
Vincula rerum laxet, et ingens
Pateat tellus, Tiphysque novos
Detegat orbes, nec sit terris
Ultima Thule.

which prediction actually came to pass in the Middle Ages.

The ruins which exist in Central America do not appear to have attracted much attention until the year 1786, when Captain Antonio Del Rio was sent by the Spanish Government to examine some ancient buildings which had been recently discovered near Palenque.

It appears from his report that these buildings were ancient at the time of the Spanish Conquest, and that the people who then lived in the neighbourhood could give no account of their origin. A few Spanish travellers had visited some of these remains before Del Rio, and latterly Waldeck, Stephens, Norman and others have published descriptions of some of the ruins in Yucatan; but the account which we possess are far from being perfect. The first consideration which strikes one is the circumstance that these remains of ancient cities are either on or near the Eastern coast, and that they decrease in number and architectural grandeur and excellence towards the interior. There can be no doubt that the population of America came principally from the North west, but although the mounds which are to be found in the Mississippi and the adjoining valleys prove that the people who raised them were not savages, they equally show that they had made but small

advances in the arts of civilized life, and there is no evidence to lead one to suppose that in migrations to the south they had by their own unaided efforts raised themselves in the state of civilization. Their traditions indeed prove the contrary; for the Mexicans and Peruvians ascribed the introduction of their social institutions to the teaching and influence of strangers. In Central America likewise there was some faint tradition of a similar nature; but the ignorance which the inhabitants at the time of the Spanish conquest evinced in regard to the origin of the great buildings they used or inhabited, proves that these buildings had been constructed some considerable time previous to the commencement of the 16th century. It would appear from the history of Yucatan that some internal commotions had taken place about a hundred years before the arrival of the Spaniards; in the course of which cities were destroyed, and the boundaries of the several tribes inhabiting the Peninsula much changed.

The circumstance that almost all the ruins of any importance in Central America are situated on or near the sea coast, or on or near navigable rivers, affords a presumption that these places were founded by a maritime people; and the fact that they are situated on the Eastern coast affords a presumption that the founders came from the West, namely across the Atlantic. We know very nearly the limits of the voyages made by the Northmen, and the most zealous advocate of their discoveries would be contented with Cape Hatteras as their most southern limit: thus it is unnecessary to look for their influence in Yucatan. Maritime enterprise was in a very low state in Europe in the dark Ages, and if voyages had then been made to America we should find some traces of Christianity. It is indeed not improbable that some vessels may have been driven to America by tempest, and that the worship of the cross found in some places may have been introduced in this manner, although it is very doubtful: but there was certainly no communication such as must have taken place if these cities were then built. The same reasoning precludes us from thinking that it could have taken place in the era of the Roman Empire, and therefore if there was any such communication at all it must have taken place before Roman supremacy was established.

Now it has been shown that there are to be found in the classics allusions to land of great extent beyond the Atlantic; and the descriptions there given of the climate, distance, rivers, and cities would coincide with Central America and the neighbouring Islands, if we could find there any traces of the influence of a Phœnician or Carthaginian Colony.

To enter into this question in a satisfactory manner would require a more accurate knowledge of the ancient ruins to be found there than we now possess. The accounts which the travellers above referred to have given are very meagre, and however deserving of commendation they undoubtedly were, they were notwithstanding not men of that knowledge of antiquities, and of that ability, which has led to such valuable results from the labours of Layard at Nineveh, or Newton at Budrum. All that can here be done is to cite the observations of the earliest writers who described the country, and those of later travellers, on points connected with the present enquiry.

It was in Yucatan and the neighbouring Islands that the Spaniards first met with any signs of an advanced civilization.

But the people who inhabited that country were a warlike race, and inflicted several defeats on the invaders; and this circumstance, together with the absence of gold mines, led the Spaniards to pass on to Mexico, and thus Yucatan was lost sight of in comparison with the superior attractions which other regions of the New world presented.

Gomara, in his work on the Conquest of Mexico, describes the houses in Cozumel as built of stone and brick; and the temples as being particularly well constructed. He mentions a large temple situated near the sea; the idol belonging to this temple was considered oracular, and he describes the manner in which the priests entered into the image by means of a secret door, and answered the petitions of the worshippers. The people were very religious, and on account of the oracle the island was much resorted to. A large marble cross was worshipped when want of rain was experienced. There was little water in the island, and that was collected in cisterns. Gomara gives a similar description of the buildings in Yucatan, and states that a very great fair was held annually at Xicalanco, where merchants came from distant lands. Every town in that country had its temple, but the great sanctuaries were at Xicalanco and Cozumel. Human sacrifices, especially children, were offered; dogs were also sacrificed, and incense was burnt in religious services. And it is added that the people practised the rite of circumcision.

Bernal Diaz in his history of the Conquest of Mexico mentions Indian merchants as being at Cozumel when Cortez arrived there; and in the account of the battle at Tabasco describes the natives as using trumpets, horns and timbrels.

Peter Martyr, who was careful in collecting information from trustworthy sources, mentions a large city on the coast of Yucatan, containing turretted houses, stately temples, and

well paved streets, the inhabitants of which were well clothed. He gives a similar account of Cozumel; adding that marble pillars were found there, as well as the remains of ancient buildings which had even at that time fallen into ruins. Peter Martyr also learnt that the furniture and hangings used by the natives were good and rich; and that they possessed innumerable books which differred in nothing from European books, that the contents were in a kind of hieroglyphic writing, and the leaves made of the inner rind of trees. These books contained accounts of their religious rites and ceremonies, as well as legal, astronomical, and agricultural information. (4th Decade. 8th chapter.)

We thus see that along this part of the coast a people lived at the time of the Spanish Conquest who were considerably advanced in civilization: that they encouraged the visits of strangers: that human sacrifices, and especially of children, were universal, although at the same time the people abstained from eating human flesh, which even the Mexicans encouraged; that they possessed an organized priesthood and an oracle. The priests are described as wearing long black mantles like the Dominicans; and the worshippers in the excitement of their festivals cut themselves so as to draw blood in honour of their deities. The people, and more especially the women, are described as being well clothed, and in this respect their customs which were oriental in strictness bore a striking contrast to half naked tribes in their vicinity.

To give a lengthened description of the buildings would demand more space than can be given to it here. It will therefore be sufficient to remark that the arrangement of the bricks in the Pyramid of Quetzalwalt at Cholula, to diminish the pressure by making the upper course overlap the under, in the form of inverted steps is found in Egyptian and other ancient remains: (Bradford's American Antiquities p. 77.) that the dresses of the figures at Copan, especially the caps on the head and sandals on the feet (ibid. p. 97) bear a striking oriental resemblance: that the style of architecture at Uxmal, especially the figures similar to caryatides, as well as the accessory ornaments are similar to Egyptian art (ibid. p. 102).

Norman in his 'Rambles in Yucatan,' points out a resemblance between the building called the "Dome" at Chichen-Itza and the Greenan temple in Donegal. Stephens describes subterranean chambers in shape like a dome and coated with plaster. These are found in many places, but the best account is at p. 227 of the 1st volume of his travels in Yucatan. These are however similar to the Phœnician cisterns to be found by the Mediterranean especially those on the site of Carthage.

Mr. Stephens describes them (now empty) as being dome shaped, and gives the dimension of one as 10 feet 6 inches deep, and 17 feet 6 inches in diameter; he does not give the dimension of others, but says that there are at Uxmal several close together. Dr. Davis describes the cisterns at Carthage (p. 392) as 18 in number, in shape circular, 19 feet 6 inches in width, and containing a depth of 17 feet of water.

There are two peculiarities in which the Temple built by Solomon as described by Josephus, Antiq. VII. 3, resembled those of the former inhabitants of Yucatan, viz. the smallness of the doors and absence of windows, and the communication between the ground floor and upper stories being by means of steps on the outside of the building instead of by means of internal stairs. Solomon's Temple was built by artificers from Tyre, who would probably have constructed it after the plan of similar buildings in their own country, and this would furnish an additional link in favour of the argument here maintained.

The use of paved roads, as well as the emblems found on the buildings in Central America, more particularly the winged globe, the open hand, the frequency of the serpent symbol, the hawk headed figures of divinities, the figures and dresses of the persons represented on the monuments, especially those offering sacrifices, the kind of pottery and its ornaments, the gorgon-like images with protruding tongues, the remains of avenues of colossal statues, are all points on which much might be said, and the united testimony of which, each possessing an oriental characteristic, affords strong evidence in support of these views.

In the preceding Note a reference has been made to the origin of the Basques, and a suggestion has been offered that they are the descendants of an Eastern Colony. If these views are correct some resemblances might be expected to exist between their customs and those of the people of Yucatan. Both the Basques and the Indians of Central America are extremely fond of dancing, and there is a very peculiar Biscayan dance which Clavigero describes as having been known to the Mexicans, and in his time still kept up in Yucatan. "They fixed in the earth a tree or strong post, 15 or 20 feet high, from the top of which, according to the number of dancers, they suspended 20 or more small cords all long and of different colours. When each dancer had taken hold of the end of his cord, they all began to dance to the sound of musical instruments, crossing each other with great dexterity until they formed a beautiful network of the cords round the tree, on which the colours appeared chequered in admirable

order." (History of Mexico. Book 7. sect. 45.) The Indian women in Yucatan still wear their hair in one plait hanging down the back, and also wear a petticoat with the same kind of border as the Basque women. The men still wear Sandals.

The Druids are commonly supposed to have learnt from the Phœnicians the doctrines which they taught. The black dress they ordinarily wore is also considered to be of the samie ori gin, and would seem to agree exactly with the descripton of dresses formerly worn by the Priests in Cozumel and Yucatan. The form of the sacrificial altars at Carnac in Brittany would likewise seem to agree exactly with those found in Central America.

Such then are the grounds on which I would advance the opinion that the civilization of Yucatan was the result of communication with strangers of Phœnician or some kindred race. The traditions of the former Inhabitants of America uniformly point to the teaching of strangers as the source from whence their knowledge of the arts of social life was derived. Manco Capac is described by Garcillaso de la Vega as a stranger appearing on the shores of the Lake of Titicaca and announcing himself as the Child of the Sun sent to teach mankind the religion and customs pleasing to the Deity. Other accounts represent him as coming from the Pacific, but all agree that he was a stranger. The Mexicans in like manner ascribed their civilization to the teaching of Quetzalcoalt, a white man with a large beard, who was afterwards deified; and who on his departure from the shores of the Gulf of Mexico declared that his descendants would come in future ages (and necessarily across the Atlantic) to claim possession of the country; and Cortes reports that Montezuma told him that he considered the Spaniards to be the people whose arrival had been expected. (Humboldt's Researches in descriptions of Cholula. Cortes. 2nd Letter. 4. Chapter.) The progress of the Aztecs can indeed be traced with tolerable accuracy. They arrived at Mexico about the year 1160. The Toltecs, a highly civilized people, lived there before them, but had been nearly destroyed by a very severe famine and pestilence; and the Aztecs occupied the vacant territory. We can easily gather from the rude remains and inscriptions in the Gila Country that their capacity and state of manners when they commenced their migration to Mexico, was little superior to that of the ordinary North American Indians, and it is undoubtedly to the remnant of the Toltecs who became mingled with them, and whose sacred edifices they used, that the Aztec, or as it is commonly called Mexican, civilization is to be attributed. I have not met with any original statement of traditions in Yucatan on

this subject, but Bradford (American Antiquities p. 201) referring to the Mayas, says, without giving his authority, "their great legislator Zamna, like Quetzalcoalt appeared from the east."

Thus the traditions of the country as far as they go support the views here advocated; which I will now proceed to explain more in detail. I do not intend to say that it is probable that frequent voyages were made in ancient times to America, or that any great commerce was carried on, but that voyages were made to America, and a tolerably accurate knowledge of the country was obtained, by the Phœnicians or Carthaginians, and perhaps by both people. The discovery may very probably have been first made by accident, as it was subsequently by the Northmen, and according to Garcillaso de la Vega by the shipmaster from whom Columbus obtained the information which induced him to set his enterprise on foot; and the fact was kept as secret as possible.

Some small colonies were probably planted, but being in many instances seamen the colonists were not qualified to teach in any high degree the arts of civilized life. The people among whom they settled, the Mayas, are a docile race and would therefore be likely to receive favourably the instruction of foreign settlers. Nearly 2000 years must have elapsed between the arrival of the last colony from Carthage and the discovery by Columbus. In this interval great vicissitudes had befallen every country in the old world, and similar events must also be supposed to have taken place in America. Supposing then the original colonists to have been almost entirely men, who had formed marriages with the women of the country, it is not surprising that few if any linguistic affinities are to be found; and that the resemblances to be found in their buildings and customs are only such as can be accounted for on these grounds. The descendants of the Carthaginian settlers may have been exterminated in war, for we find evident traces of a people similar to the North American Indians in Central America, their symbol, the small red hand, is impressed on the ancient buildings, and their form of sepulture is frequently met with.

Thus the edifices and monuments of later date may be expected to be of very inferior workmanship. It is not reasonable to consider the different ruins as of one and the same age, and I should on the above grounds consider the best constructed to be of the greatest antiquity, but the country has been so slightly explored that it is not possible to classify them in a manner at all satisfactory.

Another consideration which I think bears some influence as to the probability of a foreign agency having introduced the first elements of civilization into Central America is afforded by the circumstance that communication between these ancient cities must have been chiefly by water. It appears from the earliest accounts of Yucatan that in the Northern part of that country there were paved roads, but in the interior Cortes in his extraordinary march from Mexico to Nito found none, although he passed near Palenque and Copan, and visited Peten. The fact that the people who at the time of the Spanish Conquest lived at Palenque could give no account of the origin of the edifices at that place would confirm the idea that they were an intrusive population. The inhabitants of the coast had ceased to be a maritime people, and this would account for the circumstance, otherwise difficult to be explained, that although various nations were found on the mainland inhabiting well built houses and acquainted with many of the art of civilized life, yet the people on the Islands in their neighbourhood were in a state of barbarism.

In 1851 my Father was able to put into execution a plan which he had long formed of visiting Yucatan. His official duties at Havana prevented his leaving that place until the summer, but as under any circumstances the servile war then raging would have prevented an exploration of the Peninsula, he thought it advisable not to defer visiting the coast and especially the Island of Cozumel, which appears to have been the sacred Island of the former inhabitants. The travellers who had previously visited that country (with the sole exception I believe of Colonel Galinda at Copan) had made no excavations; but my Father considered that it was most essential to try to discover traces of the builders of these cities by means of the relics to be found in their sepulchres. As is the case in all such expeditions much time was lost in ascertaining the position of the tombs. Several were found and examined; and their contents, flint spear heads or knives, copper and pebble instruments or weapons, figures of divinities with hawk heads, images of tortoises, incense burners, and pottery vases, were brought to England. A very curious female bust with gauntlet gloves on the hands was also found in a tomb. A small piece of silver, much worn or beaten, was discovered in a grave on the coast of Yucatan, it is of irregular shape but bears no trace of an inscription and may have been inlaid as an ornament. In another grave a white glass bead was found; and with one person several stalactites were buried, as was the case in a tomb opened by Colonel Galinda at Copan.

The form of sepulture was the same in all instances. The

body was *buried*, looking towards the west and the ornaments were laid on either side.

Thus evidence was obtained that the form of sepulture was different from that of the Indians of America, and is exactly similar to that of the Phœnicians as described by the Scholiast in Thucydides. In speaking of certain tombs at Delos which had been opened he says that some were known to be Phœnician for the following reason, "*τῶν ἄλλων γὰρ ἐπ' ἀνατολὰς ποιούντων ὁρᾷν τοὺς νεκρούς, οἱ φοίνικες ἐξεπίτηδες ἐπὶ δύσιν*" I. 8. "Other nations bury the dead looking towards the east, the Phœnicians (lay them) with care towards the west."

Much information was obtained respecting the position o other ruins, as well as those actually examined, for my Father only made a cursory visit to aid him in preparing for a more complete exploration. This object he was not able to accomplish, and he deferred writing the result of his first journey in the hope that a second would have enabled him to put forward a work containing further and more valuable particulars.

I may state that he learned from mahogany cutters that in British Honduras on the banks of the Belize river there are the ruins of a very fine city, which has never been visited by a scientific traveller, and one of the men gave him a pebble fish of a green colour which he had found there. This object may have had its shape naturally, but at all events the hole drilled for the eyes is artificial, and no lapidary of the present day could do it more perfectly.

My Father considered that if this theory of a Phœnician or Carthaginian Colony is correct, traces must be looked for on the sea coast. The representations which different travellers have given us of the monuments in Central America have been *drawings*, but however well the outline of a building and its general characteristics can be thus delineated, inscriptions and matters of detail cannot be accurately transcribed in this manner. If copies of the celebrated inscription of Darius at Behistan had been made by drawing instead of by means of paper casts the cuneiform character might yet have remained undecyphered. It is therefore of consequence to obtain correct representations of these monuments, but in the first instance our own territory and the adjoining coast should be carefully examined by competent persons provided with a photographic apparatus. Our government has most liberally contributed to the exploration of Africa and to excavations in the Levant, and surely it is a national discredit to leave unnoticed important antiquities in our American possessions. A thousand pounds would amply suffice to defray the expenses of such an expedition,

which, fixing its head quarters at Belize, would be able in the winter season to carry out a plan of operation similar to that just suggested. A definite expense would be thus fixed, and after an examination of the result obtained a decision could be come to whether it would be desirable to continue the researches. I have for some years given the subject much attention, and should look for great results from such an undertaking; the inevitable expense would probably preclude any private individual from attempting it, besides which to ensure success it should have government support. I should be glad to afford any assistance in my power, and believe that the information which I have obtained at different times would prove of use in carrying out the scheme I have ventured to recommend.

C. M. K.